

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXII.]

APRIL, 1854.

[Vol. X.

PUBLIC EDUCATION.*

THERE is something very trying to the patience, or impatience, of youthful enthusiasm, in the slow, cumbrous, complicated, laborious manner in which any great measure of social reform is worked out. The hopeless and interminable array of conflicting interests and prejudices, the active and persevering opposition of "vested rights," the fickleness and apathy of the public, the cautious, compromising and trimming policy of the Government, and the suffocating accumulation of technical details (that strangling "*red tape*" which Dickens has so graphically described in his *Household Words*), combine to suggest the wish that a clean sweep could be made of the whole enormous mass of "statutes," "minutes" and "blue books," and that a few clear-headed, sensible, practical men, having a *tabula rasa* before them, should proceed to codify the collective sense of the nation in a clear, concise, intelligible and scientific arrangement of principles and regulations.† The blue books on the Hull election alone, which a strong man can scarcely carry, containing upwards of 8000 questions and answers, are a sample of the manner in which our legislation is smothered under a load of "commissions," "inquiries" and "reports," and real progress encumbered by formal minutiae. A hasty and superficial reasoner might be tempted to wish for an enlightened and trustworthy despotism, by which all encumbrances and delays might be swept away, and wise and necessary measures at once carried into effect with simplicity and completeness. Such a wish, however, besides being obviously vain, would neglect the important principle, essential to a secure and wholesome progress, that social reform should be worked out, not *for* a people, but *by* them; that it should be a natural and vital growth from their own intelligent consciousness of their wants, not forced mechanically upon unappreciating recipients. A wiser and more hopeful wish would be, that our representative system might be rendered more complete and true, so that the real will of the nation might be obeyed with less

* Public Education as affected by the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council from 1846 to 1852; with Suggestions as to future Policy. By Sir Jas. Kay Shuttleworth, Bart. Pp. 500. London—Longman, 1853.

A Bill to establish Free Schools in England and Wales for Secular Instruction. Manchester—Johnson, Rawson and Co.

† We are glad to see that the Lord Chancellor is taking in hand this Herculean but inestimably important task.

impediment and delay from interest, prejudice and technicality, and a want universally acknowledged and felt, be more rapidly supplied.

The Education question is a striking example of the difficulty and delay attendant on the carrying out of what all admit to be a great and urgently needed measure. A generation has grown up from childhood to maturity during the agitation of this question of questions, yet nothing has been accomplished at all commensurate with the greatness of the need. It would seem as if all parties had agreed to concentrate their efforts in raising objections to every scheme proposed, instead of heartily and candidly endeavouring to co-operate in the production of some practical result. It certainly seems greatly to be deplored, as a writer in the *Westminster Review* remarked, that the Government did not exert themselves to set on foot a liberal and thorough system of public education immediately after the passing of the Reform Bill, when there was an overwhelming preponderance of liberal members in the House of Commons, and when ecclesiastical opposition would not have been mischievously powerful. The opportunity was lost; a conservative reaction set in, and the Aristocracy and the Church regained undue ascendancy. Notwithstanding this mistake, however, and in spite of all obstacles, there is satisfactory reason for believing that the question has made progress, and that there is a growing tendency to unanimity of feeling, or at least to the possibility of practical co-operation. The arrogant tone assumed by the High-Church party has been greatly moderated, or at all events has not been responded to by the Church as a body; and, strictly as the teaching of the Creed and Catechism and the orthodox interpretation of the Scriptures are enforced in Church-of-England schools, it must be admitted that an immense improvement is being effected in the character and amount of secular instruction also given. A great step was gained, and the admission of an important principle secured, when the Committee of Council on Education succeeded in establishing their plan of granting impartial aid to schools supported by all religious denominations, in proportion to the amount of voluntary effort, and on condition of a certain standard of secular instruction, tested by periodical inspection. It is quite true that the great majority of the aid thus given has been appropriated by Church-of-England schools, and in a much greater proportion than the members of that Church bear numerically to the rest of the population, owing to their preponderance in wealth, to the widely-distributed revenues and influence of the bishops and clergy, and to the factitious zeal of corporate, ecclesiastical ambition, universally operating and systematically directed. But this is a state of things for which the Committee of Council cannot be held responsible, and which does not affect the fairness and liberality of the principle on which

they acted. It must be remembered, to their honour, how strenuously and successfully they insisted, in opposition to the National Society, on the "management clauses," which secured a lay element in the administration of the schools and exempted them from entire subjection to clerical authority, and on the admission of the children of Dissenters, without compulsory instruction in the tenets of the Church, in districts where no Dissenting school existed. It must be borne in mind that another cause of the great preponderance of public aid received by Church-of-England schools, has been the conscientious refusal on the part of the great majority of the Congregational and Baptist bodies to accept that aid for their own schools. We confess that we have never been able to see the reasonableness of their objection. The allegation that the Committee of Council endow all forms of religious error, seems to us singularly untrue, inasmuch as, in all schools except those of the Church of England, they most carefully abstain from interfering with the religious management of the school, and grant their aid expressly and solely with reference to the secular instruction given. The only case in which we can see the applicability of the objection, is in the Church-of-England schools, the inspectors of which are appointed with the sanction of the Archbishop of the province, and examine the religious training of the scholars and pupil-teachers. There is, therefore, some ground for asserting that the grants made to Church-of-England schools, and the salaries of their inspectors, are an extension of the Church Establishment; but we cannot see that this alone justifies a conscientious refusal on the part of Dissenters to accept educational aid which is not bound up with the inculcation of religious dogmas. Even the stipulation that the reading of the Scriptures in the authorized version should form part of the daily routine in all schools receiving Government aid, was withdrawn by the minute of July 10, 1847, and the direction of the religious instruction of each school is left without inquiry to the discretion of the managers. The extreme advocates of what is called the Voluntary principle in regard to Education, take what seems to us an impracticable and hopeless position, by affirming, first, that education ought not to be dissociated from religion; secondly, that it cannot be combined with religion at the public expense without violating their consciences; and therefore that any system of national education must be liable to an inherent and fatal objection. They "deprecate every attempt to establish by law a national system of education, whether with or without religion. As Voluntaries, in reference to religion, they cannot approve of a scheme which includes religion; and, as Christian men, they cannot approve of a system which excludes religion."*

* Letter from Mr. Joseph Fletcher, in the Manchester Guardian of February 8, 1854.

This seems to us, we must confess, the *reductio ad absurdum* of the voluntary principle in reference to education. If there be children whose parents are unable or indisposed to have them educated, it is the obvious right and duty of the community, not merely from the dictates of Christian benevolence, but also in self-defence, to see that the means of education, at least, shall be made universally accessible. An ignorant, degraded, uneducated, or rather *ill*-educated class, trained up in vice, beggary, theft and crime, is a public nuisance as well as a national disgrace. Why should the removal and prevention of this greatest of all social evils be left to the casual operation of spontaneous effort, more than any other measure of sanitary or social reform? What right has the nation to expect that the spontaneous generosity of the discerning, benevolent and energetic few, shall charge itself with this great work, more than with the sewerage, cleansing and lighting of public streets, the repairs of public roads, or the expenses of public legislation and judicature? What are our legislative and municipal bodies but committees of management, appointed by the community, with the sanction of law, to regulate all matters pertaining to the common weal? After the utmost exertions on the part of religious sects in the establishment and support of schools, there still remain, on the lowest computation, at least one million children in the country, of an age suitable for school, who are receiving no school education whatever, without making any allowance for the miserably inadequate character of much that passes under that name. It appears from the Registrar-General's returns, that about one-third of the men and about one-half of the women married, are unable to sign their names in the marriage register. It appears, further, from Mr. Horace Mann's Report on the Census of 1851, that of persons able to attend religious worship, upwards of five millions* in England and Wales attend no place of worship whatever. It is therefore clear that there is a large mass of the population whom the educational efforts of religious bodies for the most part fail to reach. Can any thoughtful man maintain that it is better for this mass to remain without school education, than that it should be supplied independently of religious organizations? The zeal which has put forth spasmodic efforts from time to time, and which has undoubtedly effected much, though falling far short of what is needed, has not been, and could not reasonably be expected to be, a purely educational zeal. The great aim of the Established Church and of the religious bodies generally has been, not simply to educate the people, but to attach them to their own religious communions. Their efforts have thus been bestowed, for the most part, on a certain limited sphere, to the neglect of a region of outer darkness apart from them all. Even

* 5,288,294.

this zeal, too, has largely partaken of the less pure motives of sectarian rivalry, the action of which has no doubt been greatly stimulated by the mode of distributing the Government grants. The operations of the Committee of Council, by being confined to schools in connection with religious bodies, are chargeable with the same essential imperfection as the voluntary efforts themselves. They grant aid from the public purse wherever there are, to begin with, wealth and intelligent energy; but they do nothing for those benighted masses which, from poverty and degradation, are unable to help themselves and unconscious of their wants; and in which, therefore, education is most deeply and urgently needed. It cannot be denied, however, that the Committee of Council have greatly advanced the cause of public education, and done much to prepare the way for a more perfect and comprehensive scheme. By the system of inspection, the stipends to pupil-teachers, the examinations instituted for Queen's scholarships, and the help given to the formation and support of the numerous training-schools now in operation for teachers of both sexes, they have unquestionably caused a rapid rise in the quality of the education given, and secured an increasing phalanx of valuable teachers in readiness for the work that remains to be done. Most of the progress which has been made of late years, and of which voluntarism is apt to boast, is really due to the Government grants, and their operation in provoking the jealous emulation of rival sects. It is satisfactorily shewn by Sir James Kay Shuttleworth in the volume before us, "that even the present rate of progress is in a great degree owing to the fact, that the Parliamentary grants have been distributed so as to stimulate private exertions. The controversies which have attended the successive proposals to Parliament, have also provoked the most earnest efforts to collect money for the defence of some principle conceived to be at stake."*

Sir James seems to us to dispose completely and successfully of the objections to a system of national education raised by the Voluntary party. After shewing the liability of subscriptions and school-pence to fall off in bad times, he proceeds:

"Even in the fairest periods of prosperity, the school income derived from these sources is precarious. Dr. Hook graphically describes the humiliating course of canvassing for subscriptions, which has become the most harassing, but unavoidable, duty of the clergy. The inspectors report the undue sacrifices made by parochial ministers, from small stipends, to support schools in rural districts."—"Every statesman is conscious that, to tax the benevolent only, is the worst form of inequality in the incidence of public burthens."—"These inequalities ought not to exist. It is not sufficient to answer that they will cease when all men are actuated by a sense of the duties of their station as members of a Christian commonwealth. Such a form of society has great

* Public Education, &c., p. 258.

collective duties. A Christian government cannot permit its citizens to be cradled in ignorance; nurtured by bad example in barbarous manners; brought up without faith and without hope; rude and miserable, the support of sedition, the prey of demagogues, the element of popular tumults, the food of the gaol, the convict ship, and the gallows. A Christian commonwealth cannot wait till the indigent are in comfort; till the Arabs of our great cities are settled and at rest; till the corrupted and ignorant are so far weaned from gross sensual indulgence, as not to waste the school-pence of their children on beer, spirits and tobacco."—"Is society to continue to pay upwards of two millions, annually, for the repression of crime, and five millions for the relief of indigence, because, though this outlay is derived from compulsory assessments, the consciences of a minority would be afflicted, if a remedy for these chronic social distempers were purchased by the same means? It is the distinction of arbitrary governments that, when directed by a powerful intelligence, they afford prompt and efficacious means for the execution of the measures which a provident wisdom dictates. Nothing would so certainly discredit representative institutions, as that popular minorities should obtain a collective power to obstruct the civilization which they are incompetent to establish. Yet the question of National Education in the United Kingdom has exhibited the lamentable spectacle, hitherto, of such minorities triumphant over the collective will of the nation as represented in Parliament."—"Shall the priests of Joanna Southcote, at Ashton-under-Lyne, and the Mormonites, throughout our manufacturing and mining districts, be free to build and maintain schools, and the Government of a Christian State be excluded from every form of interference? Yet such is the doctrine of the purely Voluntary party."—"Is Government, then, in no sense a moral agent? May it incarcerate criminals, and separate itself, as an impassive spectator, from all the festering moral pollution of the common wards of the old prison, and the terrible agonies of the separate cell?"—"Or is the workhouse merely a pauper farm, where certain human animals are fed at the least cost to the parish, till, nailed between rough boards, their bodies are buried like dogs by the sexton and the beadle? Is this a Christian household, or a pauper *barracoon*? Can the State separate itself from certain grave and high responsibilities as to the spiritual future of these unfortunates? Are the children to remain ignorant and rude; the adults, servile or disaffected helots; the aged, torpid expectants of a grave without hope?"—"What is the distinction between the reckless indigent classes out of the workhouse and those within its walls? They are both within the reach of voluntary agency. The city missionary may penetrate to both. But has Government a responsibility for the moral depravity and mental incapacity of the one, which it in no degree partakes with respect to the other? Such an argument is obviously untenable. I have already quoted the formula in which Dr. Vaughan embodies the doctrine, which falls into none of these absurdities and inconsistencies. 'Government,' he says, 'MAY be a moral teacher to the extent that it MUST be a moral administrator.'"

The above are detached passages from an elaborate argument, which certainly seems conclusive as to the right and duty of the

* Public Education, &c., pp. 276—282.

community to promote by law such measures of social and moral reform as can be carried into effect without doing violence to conscientious differences of religious opinion. In an earlier part of his volume, Sir James gives due credit to the National Public School Association for having vindicated this right and duty on the part of the community, in opposition to the extreme advocates of the voluntary principle, appealing also to the expressed opinions of Dr. Vaughan, Mr. Binney and the late Dr. Chalmers, in favour of this view. It is to be remarked, however, that the objection to the voluntary principle, as incompetent to make adequate provision for the education of the people at large, applies proportionally to the efforts of the Committee of Council, inasmuch as they are confined to the aiding of voluntary efforts. It is now generally agreed by all who are in favour of a system of public education at all, that a more comprehensive measure is required.*

We will now, therefore, apply ourselves to the consideration of the principle on which such a measure should be founded. It is gratifying here to be able to remark the great approximation which has taken place between the plan of the National Public School Association and its imitative rival, the Manchester and Salford Local Scheme. The former was certainly open to objection, both theoretically and practically, in its original form, by seemingly threatening to extinguish existing schools. It is clear that the erection of rate-supported, free, secular schools, in competition with schools sustained by voluntary religious effort, aided by school-pence, would have tended to supersede the latter altogether, thus not merely supplementing the efforts of religious bodies, but taking education wholly out of their hands. By the clauses recently added to their proposed Bill, the National Association provide for the admission of existing schools to the benefit of the rate, on condition that any specific religious instruction shall be given at certain defined hours, apart from those occupied in secular instruction, and that the attendance on such religious instruction shall not be made compulsory. It would also be competent for the school committee to let the school buildings established under the Act to parties desirous of renting them for the purpose of religious instruction, on the Sunday and at the other periods during the week when the secular schools were appointed to be closed. Though these recent modifications, or rather explanations of the original plan, seem to us to render it much more practically unobjectionable, we cannot agree with Sir J. K. Shuttleworth in regarding them as an abandonment of their fundamental principle, which was simply this—that schools

* Sir James himself lays down the maxim (p. 245), that "a national system of education must have a wide basis. It is not even sufficient that it should be sustained by every religious communion. The members of every such body are citizens as well as communicants. *If they found schools for purely sectarian ends, they will fail to win the national sympathy.*"

should be supported by a public rate, under local management, and that no part of the rate should be applied to religious instruction of a sectarian character. Perhaps the leading advocates of the secular plan, keenly alive to the evils arising from the mass of existing ignorance, and impatient of the obstacles presented by contending sects, may have been too prone to undervalue and even to ignore what has actually been effected by voluntary effort, under the stimulus of Government aid. Perhaps they may have spoken too irreverently of the objections raised by religious sects, in characterizing their contentions as the squabbles of selfish party spirit and jealous ambition. Those who largely devote their money and their time,—those, above all, who make it the sole business of their lives, with miserable pecuniary recompence, to provide spiritual as well as intellectual and moral culture for the young, may be bigoted, narrow-minded, mistaken, but are surely the last to be denounced as selfish. Their zeal may have been religious rather than educational, but still it must have been, for the most part, a generous zeal for the good of others; and it is an unquestionable fact, that nearly all that has been done hitherto by voluntary effort in the work of popular education, has been done on religious principles and from religious motives.

Under the impulse of the same feelings, the secular educationists have perhaps treated with too much respect the alleged suspicion and dislike on the part of the great mass of the uneducated, in relation to sectarian schools, as so many proselytizing traps. Whilst we would earnestly advocate the extension of educational influences as thoroughly as possible among that class, we must confess that any feelings which indispose them to meet the generous efforts of religious men to make them better as well as wiser, are to be lamented rather than respected. We remember once conversing on the proposal of the Manchester and Salford Local Association, to give the benefit of the rate to all schools in which the Scriptures were used *in any version* (to meet the case of the Roman Catholics); when it was asked what was to become of those who held the Scriptures in *aversion*. Whilst acknowledging the point, as well as wit, of this query, we cannot believe that the alleged aversion of the uneducated and degraded for the devotion of the Old Testament or for the Christianity of the New, is of a conscientious, philosophical or respectable character. These remarks, however, apply rather to the tone of observations which have occasionally fallen from advocates of the National Association, than to the principle of their plan; and it must not be forgotten that many of the most earnest friends of the Association have individually distinguished themselves by voluntary efforts in the work of popular education, so as to be able to speak from practical experience of the agencies in operation, and of their incompetency to meet the existing want.

Whilst thus far assenting, however, to the representations of those who claim that a just regard should be had to the interests of existing schools, we cannot join in the condemnation which some are still disposed to pass on the secular principle as godless and irreligious, or even as making slight account of the importance of religious influences in the work of education. It seems to us, on the contrary, that the secular principle is the only one that holds in due reverence the rights of conscience, by abstaining from all interference with voluntary effort in its proper and rightful province of religious conviction and impulse. If the whole nation were of one form of faith, there would be no difficulty or impropriety in applying a public rate to the complete work of education, including religious training; but, with the existing variety of conscientious convictions as to religious truths, impartial justice seems to demand that a separation be made between that part of education on which all can agree, and that part on which all differ, even though such separation be deemed in itself a necessary evil. The evil, however, has been, we think, magnified beyond its necessary dimensions. It is notorious that the separation already exists in all day-schools for the children of the middle and higher classes, their religious education being left entirely to the discretion of their parents, aided by the ministers of religion to whom they may think fit to commit them. In reply to this, it is argued that the classes for which it is most urgently needful to provide public schools, are precisely those which cannot be trusted to supply the religious element from their own resources or by the exercise of their own discretion. To this objection it may be answered, first, that it would at least be a vast improvement on the present state of things if every child received a sound education in all that can be taught without doing violence to religious convictions. The mental training, the habits of thought, the varied knowledge, the moral tone, that might thus be imparted, would not only be a great gain in themselves, but would immensely facilitate the voluntary efforts of sincere and faithful religious teachers. They would have intelligent material to work upon, trained and furnished minds to deal with, and thus be saved the dreary drudgery now often imposed upon them, of imparting elementary instruction as a necessary preliminary to the perusal and comprehension of the Word of Life. Again, in dealing with this question, men are too apt to confound religious influence with theological instruction. It would surely not be difficult for an earnest and conscientious teacher to exert a wholesome and even spiritual influence on the character of the children by the tone of his own precepts and example, without any dogmatic teaching that would trench upon the rights of conscience. Those who are practically conversant with good schools, conducted on a liberal principle, know that this may be done. We are ourselves acquainted with schools in which children of all denominations are educated harmoniously

together both on week-days and Sunday, and we have no reason to believe that their moral or spiritual condition is inferior to that of those who are sedulously drilled in dogmatic catechisms and creeds. The late Archbishop of Canterbury wisely discountenanced the introduction of the Church-of-England Catechism into infant schools, recommending the personal influence of the teacher as far preferable, for minds of tender age, to doctrinal formulæ of faith. Religious disputants are prone to exaggerate the practical importance of distinctive doctrines in regard even to maturer years. Who could venture to infer a man's specific creed from the tone of his character and the spirit of his life? Above all, then, in the education of the young, and especially from the most ignorant and degraded classes, there is more danger of erring on the side of too much than of too little attention to distinctive technicalities of doctrine. They should be fed with the pure milk of morality and love in the counsels and personal influence of an upright and kind teacher, before being required to swallow, much more to digest, such strong and difficult meat. It seems to us a peculiar recommendation of the secular scheme, that it would bring children together for education without reference to religious divisions, and thus prepare the way for friendly relations between members of different communions, promote a better mutual understanding, and soften theological asperities. When we further consider the fact, that the secular principle has long been in successful operation, with the best results, in the New-England States of North America, and also in Holland (whence our Government borrowed the system of pupil-teachers), and that in those countries the interests of religion are not less cared for than the work of education, it is difficult to conceive on what rational ground the principle can be deprecated for our own country.

Whilst acknowledging much that is excellent in the Manchester and Salford Local Scheme (brought forward by the clerical party in consequence of the efforts of the National Association, and borrowing their principle of local rating), we think it objectionable, by comparison with its older and more liberal rival, in the following principal respects. First, the permission for children to absent themselves from the religious lessons on the written request of their parents, might often place such children in a position so invidious and irksome, as to induce the parents to forego their right, and submit to an inculcation of doctrines in which they did not agree. Or, on the other hand, the children compelled to remain might look with envious eyes on those permitted to depart, and the religious teaching might thus be associated with weariness and disgust.* There is more simplicity in the plan of limiting the general education to certain hours, and

* A story is told of a school in which the Roman Catholic boys were allowed to go away when the Creed and Catechism were taught, and the result was that all the boys became Roman Catholic!

leaving the arrangements for specific religious instruction in all cases to voluntary effort and parental discretion. Secondly, the regulation that the Scriptures shall be read daily in all schools receiving the benefits of the rate, though it may be so interpreted and acted upon as to be of little practical importance, yet tends (to say nothing of conscientious objections) to engender anything but an intelligent or reverential appreciation of the Scriptures, thus converted into a school-book. Thirdly, the provision that, when a new school has been pronounced to be needed in any district, a certain time shall be allowed to elapse for voluntary effort to establish one, before any steps shall be taken by the school committee, seems calculated to foster an undesirable competition among religious sects to occupy the vacant ground, resulting, perhaps, in the opening of two or more ill-supported and ill-conducted schools, instead of one efficient one. Fourthly, the scheme is open to objection as giving too much power to the Committee of Privy Council, without whose sanction no by-law of the school committee can be valid, neither can any inspector be appointed except on their recommendation; a power of appeal to them also being provided in every case of dispute between the school committee and any particular school. Some degree of central control and inspection, indeed, may be desirable for the protection of the separate interests of the ratepayers and the schools; but it is clear that the appropriation of money, locally raised for a local object, ought to be under local management. The independent responsibility of municipal and other local bodies, is a leading feature in the English constitution, and an important element in our national energy, freedom and prosperity. It is true that the nation as well as the locality has an interest in the education of each district, so that we are far from objecting to a certain degree of inspection and superintendence on the part of the central government, as a check upon local abuses, and as tending also to secure a general uniformity and excellence of standard. But the Manchester and Salford Bill proposes to invest the Committee of Council with an authoritative supervision over the local committee, which, especially if we imagine it extended to all other boroughs, would be quite too much for them to exercise intelligently, in addition to their other onerous duties as Lords of the Privy Council; and the practical regulation of educational matters would be sure to devolve for the most part (as it probably does even at present) on the individual secretary and his subordinates. We much prefer, as a central authority, the National Board of Education proposed by the Secular Bill, consisting of three members (like the Board of Poor-law Commissioners), whose sole duty it should be to superintend the working of the Education Act.

There is one feature common to the Manchester and Salford and to the Secular Bills, to which Sir James Kay Shuttleworth

strongly and eloquently objects, namely, that all schools aided by rate shall be *free* schools. Sir James contends earnestly for the retention both of voluntary subscriptions, and still more of the school-pence paid by the parents, not merely for the sake of the large amount which it already yields, but for the sake of the accompanying influences on the minds of the parents themselves. With regard to voluntary subscriptions, it might be left optional with the managers of existing schools, whether to retain the subscriptions on condition of retaining the management, or to hand over their share of both support and management to the general school committee, which would perhaps be the ultimate and legitimate effect of an education-rate. But to whatever extent the rate superseded the voluntary subscriptions now paid, there would be a proportionally increased ability (if the secular principle were adopted) to supply by voluntary effort the special religious instruction for which the rate made no provision. Thus would be obviated the objection implied in Sir James's remark, that "the subscriptions represent that zeal in which the schools originated. They are the measure of their respective activity, and of their claim to control the instruction of the people."* With regard to the school-pence, it is argued that—

"though the absence of any contribution from the poor could not deprive the parents of their right to direct the education of their children, if the means were derived from public taxation, yet their school-pence render this right more apparent and incontestable."—"Nor ought the opinion of the parents to be barren and inoperative. Let the withdrawal of the child be attended by two consequences; viz. the cessation of the school-pence, and of any contribution from the State for the education of such child."—"A weekly payment from the parents of the scholars is that form of taxation, the justice of which is most apparent to the humbler classes."—"The moral advantage of a tax on the poor in the form of school-pence is, that it appeals to the sense of paternal duty. It enforces a lesson of domestic piety. It establishes the parental authority, and vindicates personal freedom. The child is neither wholly educated by religious charity, nor by the State."—"Let no one rudely interfere with the bonds of filial reverence and affection."—"Those communities are neither most prosperous, nor most happy, in which the political or social relations of the family are more prominent than the domestic. That which happily distinguishes the Saxon and Teutonic races is, the prevalence of the idea of '*home*.' To make the households of the poor scenes of Christian peace, is the first object of the school."†

Some of our author's remarks may seem fanciful, far-fetched, and contradicted by proved facts. We have never heard it alleged that the system of free public schools in the United States has rendered the parents less independent or the children less attached

* Public Education, p. 293. But it will be remembered that he elsewhere pronounces it an evil that the burden of supporting an object of general utility should fall on the benevolent few.

† Public Education, pp. 293—295.

to home. Other portions of his objection may be met by remarking that, in a rate-supported education, the parents would contribute their share as ratepayers. Such a rate, on Sir James's own showing, would be cheerfully paid by the heads of all households above the rank of the very poor, who might be specially exempted by a magistrate, in the same way as they now are from payment of poor-rate. We acknowledge that there is a propriety in parents paying towards their children's schooling, not simply as ratepayers, but *as parents*; but it does not seem to us a matter of sufficient moment to set against the simplicity and completeness obtained by rendering admission to public schools the common right of all, thus enabling willing parents, however poor, to have their children educated, and withholding the excuse of inability from the indifferent and selfish. In the case of paupers receiving out-door relief, it might most properly be made a compulsory condition (as proposed in Lord John Russell's Bill of April last) that their children should attend school, which, with a general system of rate-supported free schools, could involve no difficulty or complexity.

Much incidental aid in the promotion of general education may be looked for from the working of the recent Act for the better Administration of Charitable Trusts. The ascertained income of endowed grammar-schools amounts to upwards of £150,000, and Lord Brougham calculated the income of other educational endowments as amounting to half-a-million more. The obviation of the administrative abuses and legal complexities, which have hitherto swallowed up a large portion of these revenues and crippled their power of public utility, will set free a considerable fund for educational purposes, which may be so managed as to lighten the burden of any general educational measure.

Sir James Kay Shuttleworth gives an elaborate chapter on the state and prospects of education in Scotland. We may here take the opportunity of remarking, that his whole volume is characterized by the author's well-known statistical ability and familiarity with technical detail. As might be anticipated from his former productions and from his labours when Secretary to the Committee of Council, he is quite at home in minutes, returns, registers, averages, and tabulated results without end. He absolutely revels in them, moving lightly and even fondly in the harness of such blue-book drudgery. The volume is accordingly stuffed full with facts and evidence in the most exact and laborious forms. We think he must miss his old occupation at the Council Office, and have a strong desire occasionally "to look in on melting-days." Such a volume as the present is certainly not a kind of production that we should anticipate from an author who (as we are sorry to learn in the Preface) is "worn with work, scathed by former controversies, and slowly restored

to life after four years of suffering." Though not coinciding in all his views, we thankfully acknowledge the value of his immense services to the cause of education, and earnestly hope that he may live to see more satisfactory results than he seems to anticipate in the closing words of his Preface, following those quoted above: "I am conscious that I tread on the ashes and scoræ of unexhausted fires, and that it may seem vain to desire to convert this crater into a garden. But I remember the warning, that 'no man, having put his hand to the plough, look back.'" Several circumstances point to the immediate necessity of some educational measure in Scotland. First, the stipends of the parochial schoolmasters will be calculated, under the present law, on the average price of oatmeal during the twenty-five years preceding the present year 1854, which will have the effect (owing to the free-trade measures) of reducing the *maximum* salary from about £34 to about £25. Secondly, the disruption of the Free Church has led to the erection of separate schools in connection with that body, and rendered the parochial schools in connection with the Established Church less national in their character, as well as less under the control of the Presbyteries. Thirdly, the miserable condition of the schools and teachers in the Highlands and Islands, seems imperatively to require the aid of some general measure. The schools in Scotland have hitherto been conducted on a tolerant and impartial principle; and as there is a much greater doctrinal accordance between the religious communions there than in England, it may be desirable to adopt a different basis for the educational measure required. At the same time it is notorious that in the large towns in Scotland, as in England, there is a considerable proportion of the population not in connection with any religious communion, which forms, to our apprehension, a strong argument for the application of the secular principle there as well as here, in the manner and for the reasons already stated. The language of the late Dr. Chalmers, before alluded to, in reference to the impartial support of secular instruction in all schools from public funds, leaving the religious education entirely to the managers, seems to us equally applicable to the establishment of secular schools, where needed, at the public expense, leaving specific religious instruction to voluntary efforts; with the further advantage of securing the general education of those classes which religious organizations fail to reach.

"As there seems no reason why, because of these unresolved differences [in religious opinion], a public measure for the health of all—for the recreation of all—for the economic advancement of all—should be held in abeyance, there seems as little reason why, because of these differences, a public measure for raising the general intelligence of all should be held in abeyance."*

* Dr. Chalmers, quoted in *Public Education*, &c., p. 50, note.

Sir James Kay Shuttleworth deprecates the establishment of *free* schools in Scotland, as in England. He remarks,—

“The amount of the school fees paid by the working classes, in all but certain Highland and Island parishes, is a rebuke to our English customs, and a commentary on the effects of education, continued through several generations, in enabling those supported by manual labour to appreciate its advantages, which no statesman should neglect.”—“In Scotland, education in reading, writing, arithmetic, and the Holy Scriptures and formularies of the Church, costs a poor man from 10s. to 16s. a-year for each child, and yet it is so general as to be almost universal in the Lowlands of Scotland not included in great cities. This fact becomes the more significant, when it is borne in mind that generally the parents also provide the school books and all other school materials, which, whatever care be bestowed on them, must cost at least four shillings more every year. This is a subject full of interest and instruction. The example of Scotland is a complete answer to those who would make education in England entirely *free* of charge.”*

We need only repeat that, on the principle of a local rate, the education would not be free of charge to the parents, and that the example of Scotland may be well parried by that of the New-England States. Moreover, Sir James makes a statement elsewhere, which shews how fearfully inadequate the amount of education actually is even in Scotland, and what urgent need there is of some comprehensive measure. “One-third of the children who ought to be at school in Scotland, receive no public instruction; and one-half of the remainder are so taught by incompetent masters, that their education is almost fruitless.”†

No measure of public education can adequately deal with the worst of our social evils, unless it be supplemented by the systematic provision of reformatory and industrial schools for juvenile outcasts and offenders. We rejoice to see that a movement in favour of such institutions is now rapidly extending among men of all sects and parties, and we trust that no religious or other differences will stand in the way of wise attempts to deal with a class sunk so deeply below all such refined distinctions. We observe it stated in the Speeches of Theodore Parker, published in 1852, that in the city of Boston alone there were not less than 4948 children, between the ages of four and fifteen, who attended no school whatever; which seems to prove that even the most

* Public Education, pp. 345, 346. In the sequel to this passage, however, our author seems to us to contradict his own principle, for he strongly objects to “the regulation of the school fees by a cumulative scale, according to the number of subjects taught,” the reported effect of which in various presbyteries was, “that little but the rudiments of instruction was on this account given;” and he quotes with approval the Inspector’s maxim, “The additional fees should be abolished. That which should regulate the studies of the pupils should be, not their parents’ ability or willingness to pay, but their own ability or desire to learn.” Then why only the *additional* fees?

† Public Education, p. 395, also at p. 386.

perfect system of free schools is not of itself a sufficient security for the education of those so deeply in need of education as to manifest no desire to obtain it. With regard to reformatory schools, we heartily concur with the proposal that the expense of a child's maintenance in them should be made legally recoverable from the parents, whose neglect had engendered the criminal habits, or to whose wicked avarice they had been a recognized source of revenue. Such a regulation would remove the premium which would otherwise seem to be placed upon crime by taking the children of unprincipled parents off their hands. It is also, of course, essential to the efficiency of reformatory schools that magistrates should be empowered to commit to them, for discretionary periods, all children convicted of criminal conduct.

It would evidently be the effect of a complete system of general and (where needed) industrial education, to dry up the sources of pauperism and destitution. By rendering the mass of the people intelligent, orderly, industrious and skilful, it would cause them to create an immense demand for the various products of one another's labour. To the same extent that they were made useful producers, they would be remunerative consumers. Another effect of improved popular education would be by stimulating to further improvement that of the middle and higher classes. Any one who carefully looks over the examination papers set before the candidates in the training-schools, will at once perceive that an education of a very high order is being conveyed to the rising race of teachers; and that for our wealthier schools and colleges to retain their pre-eminence, they must be on the alert to keep pace with the advancing requirements of the age. We would remark, in conclusion, that although great stress is often and deservedly laid upon the political and social influences which play so important a part in the practical education of the English people, those influences are exerted not in consequence but in spite of the incompleteness of school education as it now exists; and that those same influences, when combined with a universal system of efficient school training, will reach a development and exhibit results such as have never yet been approached in excellence on this side of the Atlantic.

J. R.

OLD AGE.

THE sadness of old age proceeds from this, that our hopes, not our joys, cease.—JEAN PAUL.

2 MACCABEES ii. 13—AGE OF THE PENTATEUCH.

“The same things also were reported in the writings and commentaries concerning Nehemiah (τοῖς ὑπομνηματισμοῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Νεμίου), and how he, founding a library, gathered together the things relating to the kings and the prophets, and the things of David, and the royal epistles concerning the holy gifts.”

As this passage has been lately brought forward in the pages of the C. R. (p. 80), and applied to the question of the canon of the Old Testament, and specially the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, it may be worth while to examine more carefully its authority and import.

As to its authority, it must be observed, that the second book of the Maccabees professes to be an abridgment of an historical work of Jason of Cyrene, relating chiefly to the sufferings of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes. Jason is known only from this mention of him, and his work is rated very low by all historical critics. The statement respecting Nehemiah, however, does not proceed from him, for the abridgment of his history begins with the third chapter. The two first, as far as the 19th verse of the second, are occupied with two epistles professing to be sent from the Jews at Jerusalem to the Jews in Egypt, respecting the celebration of the Feast of the Purification. The genuineness of these epistles has been called in question, with much reason, by Eichhorn and others; and what is related in them of Jeremiah and Nehemiah, having no confirmation in their authentic writings, can be regarded only as of very doubtful authority. The passage quoted above, however, is certainly curious, as indicating the existence of a tradition that Nehemiah had formed a library in which the sacred literature of the nation was preserved.

But what bearing has this upon the origin or age of the Pentateuch? It requires a good deal of ingenuity to discover in the words, “royal epistles concerning holy gifts” (ὑναδεμάρων), *donaria*, consecrated offerings in a temple, a synonym for the Law of Moses or the Pentateuch, to which kings, epistles and consecrated offerings in temples, are equally foreign. Indeed, the restoration of the true order in which the different books are mentioned, placing the royal epistles *after*, instead of *before*, the prophets and the kings, removes even the superficial appearance of a reference to the Pentateuch in the last clause of the verse. Replaced in its proper position, its meaning can hardly be doubtful. The “royal epistles” are the letters which the Persian kings sent respecting the restoration of the sacred vessels of the temple of Jerusalem and the free-will offerings, when the Jews were allowed to return to their own land and to rebuild it. It is true that letters and proclamations are mixed together in the proceedings of the Persian kings, and that the order for the

restoration of the sacred vessels and for free-will offerings is in a decree or proclamation of Cyrus, not a letter; but that of Artaxerxes (Ezra vii. 11) which empowers Ezra "to carry the silver and gold which the king and his counsellors have freely offered unto the God of Israel whose habitation is in Jerusalem," is in the form of a letter to Ezra. It is the practice of much more accurate writers than the author of the second book of the Maccabees, to designate things *a parte potiori*. Indeed, the decrees of the Persian kings, being addressed to individuals, might very well be called epistles. Josephus (Ant. xi. 1) calls the decree of Cyrus an epistle; and gives the same name to the decree of Darius (xi. 4) addressed to Tatnai and Shetharboznai (Ezra vi.). Whether the author of the letter in the second book of the Maccabees meant to represent Nehemiah as placing in the library which he had founded the book of Ezra itself, or only the royal documents which are embodied in it, is of little moment. The Pentateuch can have no place here.

Perhaps its omission may seem strange. It would be so if Nehemiah, instead of forming a library, had been establishing a canon. But the volume of the Law held a very different place in the estimation of the Jews in that age from all the other books of the Old Testament relating to times before the captivity. Copies of it must have accompanied them to Babylon, for Ezra was by profession "a scribe of the Law;" it was the rule of their proceedings on their return, and was publicly read and expounded to the people. The historical books, the prophets and the Psalms of David, and whatever else was included in these miscellaneous titles, having a much inferior interest for the nation, not being read in public, and being very voluminous, may have existed in very few or even single copies; and to bring them together in a library, probably attached to the temple, was a very important service. They would of course be exposed to injury during the troubled times of the siege and capture of Jerusalem; and as Judas Maccabæus, according to our author (v. 14), gathered together the books that had been scattered here and there (*διαπεπτωκότα*) in the wars of the Maccabees, so did Nehemiah in regard to the sacred literature of his day. But the Law was never among the *διαπεπτωκότα*.

Though this passage can throw no light on the age or canonical authority of the Pentateuch, it may perhaps afford us some information respecting an obscure subject, the formation of the Septuagint Version. Having mentioned the services of Nehemiah and Judas in preserving and recovering the sacred books, the letter of the Jews of Jerusalem proceeds—"wherefore if ye have need thereof, send some to fetch them unto you." Unless these words refer exclusively to the books recovered by Judas, we may infer that when this letter was written, the Egyptian Jews were not known to be in possession of the post-Mosaic

books of Scripture. This accords with what we know of the history of the Alexandrian Version. The Pentateuch was translated in the reign of the first Ptolemy, the other books subsequently and piecemeal, the Prophets not till the time of the persecution under Antiochus, when the Jews of Palestine, being prohibited from the public reading of the Law, substituted the Prophets in its place. We may conclude from this passage in the second book of the Maccabees, that when the letter was written, professedly in the year 124 B.C. (2 Macc. i. 10), there still remained some books untranslated, or so recently translated that the fact was not known at Jerusalem. Hence the offer to send them to Alexandria.

It would have been a marvellous thing to find a Jewish writer stating that the authorship of the Law or the command to obey it, belonged not to Moses, but to the kings; equally so if he had assigned them to the priests. The doubts of modern criticism find no sanction even in the Apocrypha. The common opinion, which assigns the composition or compilation of the whole (such an obvious addition as Deut. xxxiv. excepted) to Moses, is not without difficulties; but have those who believe it to have been written in various ages from the Exodus to the Captivity, "here a little and there a little," and yet received by the nation as of uniform authority, weighed the difficulties which their own hypothesis involves? It is only by such a counterbalancing that the real preponderance of argument can be definitely fixed. On the other hand, some of the objections to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch appear scarcely to deserve the importance attached to them. In the work which has given rise to the present paper, Mr. Higginson says, "In Gen. xii. 6, in the history of Abram, the words, 'And the Canaanite was then in the land,' must plainly have been the addition of a transcriber or editor, after the time when the Canaanites were expelled" (p. 69). Now if the connection of this passage with the context be examined, this inference may appear unfounded. "The Canaanite was then in the land; and the Lord appeared unto Abram and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." Here is a distinct assertion that the land of Palestine was granted to Abram, the progenitor of the Israelites, while the Canaanites were in actual possession of it. Now it was against the Canaanites, and not any other nation which might before or after them have possessed this land, that the Israelites had to make good their claim. It was to take possession of it in virtue of this grant, and to drive out the Canaanites, that Moses led the people out of Egypt. Viewed in this connection, the words not only have nothing in them which indicates a later age, but are appropriate to the age of Moses and hardly to any other. It was of little consequence when the Canaanites had been driven out or subdued, to establish a grant made to the Israelites over their heads; possession was title

enough; but when the struggle was impending, it was most important that the people should be encouraged by the assurance of a divine grant and promise. The rationalist may say the story is a fiction, designed to sanction the invasion of Palestine. Supposing it were so, the argument for the antiquity of the text would remain the same; the time for producing either a forged title or a genuine one is when the possession of the estate is in dispute.

The same remark respecting the Canaanite being in the land is made, as Mr. Higginson observes, in Gen. xiii. 7: "There was a strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle; and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land." But here, too, if we examine the context, we shall find that the remark is quite appropriate to the age of Moses. It relates a formal division of the land between Abram and Lot; Lot chose him the plain of Jordan, while Abram remained in the land of Canaan. Lot's portion was swallowed up when the plain of Jordan was turned into the Dead Sea, or rendered unfit for culture by brimstone and fire, and he had to betake himself to the eastern side of the Lake and of Jordan, Abram retaining the western. Is not the mention of such a partition, and of its being made while the Canaanites and Perizzites dwelt in the land, appropriate to the time when the nation was about to engage in a death struggle with those Canaanites and Perizzites for the possession of the partitioned territory? It was of little moment in the days of David, still less of Josiah, of Jeremiah, or of Ezra, whether Jehovah had promised Canaan to the Israelites, and Abram and Lot had treated it as their own when the Canaanites were in it; there was no fear of their rising up to make good their claim.

It has been thought that Joseph could not have called his native country the "land of the Hebrews" (Gen. xl. 15), seeing that the Israelites were a mere handful of people, insufficient to have given it a name, even if they had themselves been known as Hebrews in that age. This objection might have weight against one who maintained that every discourse recorded in Genesis had been preserved *verbatim* in a contemporaneous writing, or communicated *verbatim* by inspiration to Moses. It is certain that, during their residence in Egypt, the Israelites, having grown from a family into a people, acquired the name of Hebrews. It is that by which they are usually spoken of in the history of the Exodus by the Egyptians, or by themselves when addressing Egyptians. Is it, then, inconceivable that an historian, writing in the age of the Exodus, and reporting conversations which had taken place in the age of Joseph, should use a name current in his own time, but not in use in the time of which he was writing? Such an objection would not be deemed sustainable in the case of a profane historian. Herodotus calls his

countrymen in the heroic age without scruple *Hellenes*, though he doubtless knew as well as Thucydides that in the time of Homer no such collective name was in use.

The list of kings who are said, in Genesis xxxvi. 31, to have "reigned in Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," may be regarded as the most formidable objection to the opinion that the Pentateuch was written in the age of Moses, as it seems to betray a knowledge of the actual existence of a monarchy in Israel. Admitting it to be so, it is a passage exactly of that kind which might be introduced into a genuine history at a later period, without fraudulent purpose, or without affecting the character of the whole. Even those critics who contend most strenuously for the unity of the Homeric poems, do not deny that the Catalogue of the Ships may be in part or wholly of a later date than the *Iliad*. It is not, however, so clear, as it is generally assumed to be, that this passage could not have been written by one who had not knowledge of an actual monarchy in Israel. The eight kings there enumerated may have lived before and during the time of Moses. The writer must indeed have had an *anticipation* of such an event; but more than this is perhaps not necessary to explain his language. Now Moses certainly anticipated that the Israelites would establish for themselves a monarchy; it was the natural form of government in that age, practised by all the nations round about; and it was delayed among the Israelites by the disjointed state in which their distinction into tribes long kept them, and the ascendancy acquired by the heroes who from time to time rose up among them. In Deut. xvii. 14, the case is anticipated and provided for. It may be said, indeed, that the book of Deuteronomy is no work of Moses, and that the passage in question was written after the days of Solomon. Yet a prohibition against "causing the people to return into Egypt," because Jehovah had said, "Ye shall henceforth return no more that way," seems very unlikely to have been framed under the monarchy, when the Jewish nation was as little tempted to return into Egypt, as the subjects of the Plantagenets to return to Jutland. But in the age of Moses such a caution was very natural, considering how strong a desire had shewn itself among the Israelites to go back into Egypt.

These suggestions are not offered in the hope of settling a question so long debated as the age of the Pentateuch, but only in arrest of the very decided judgment which some are ready to pronounce, that it is not of the age of Moses.

BIBLICUS.

REFORMATORY SCHOOLS.*

It has been the boast of jurists, that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of England. Since the whole is greater than the *part*, we may infer how small must be that idea of Christianity which constitutes it a fraction of our insular code: and, indeed, if the *parcel* is of the same quality as the rest, the smaller it is the better, for the law seems to have entered that offences might abound. Christianity came to substitute life for the deathsome law of Judea, and so, in time, will it for the law of England; and whilst the masses of our population, who have no ardent attachment to our law, are throwing off even a nominal allegiance to the technical Christianity which it professes to patronize, there is among our legislators a growing conviction that, if law is to repress crime, and to have its sanction in the hearts of the community, it must be in accordance with the spirit of him who spoke to the heart and vanquished sin. Jesus took in his arms and blessed the children whom his apostles would have forbid; and it is an interesting feature of this newly-awakened Christianity, that its first concern is for the children, especially for those who seem lost.

The volume of Essays before us is a book for the times. We need not stop to inquire whether it is not in the highest degree important that *adult* delinquents should be treated with Christian love; and whether juveniles, who are *not delinquents*, should not have a good education as their birthright in this land: these are vital questions; but on them many differ, who agree in the one before us; and the application of Christianity to juvenile delinquents admirably prepares for other united efforts. A Bill was introduced last session by Mr. Adderley, which, though quite in accordance with the usage of other countries, would establish among us not only a new practice, but almost a new principle. This Bill, with many improvements suggested at Birmingham, he intended to bring forward, with good promise of support. Lord Palmerston, however, has now declared that Government will deal with the question in the present session; and it is right that the public should be informed on a question which it will be asked to decide.

At the first Reformatory† Conference at Birmingham (1851), Lady Noel Byron offered, through M. D. Hill, Esq., a prize of £200 for the best essay on the subject then under consideration, of which the Dean of Salisbury, John Shaw Lefevre, M.A., the Recorder of Birmingham, and Miss Mary Carpenter, were to be

* 1. Two Prize Essays on Juvenile Delinquency. By Micaiah Hill, Esq., and C. F. Cornwallis. 12mo. Pp. 444. London—Smith, Elder and Co. 1853.

2. First Report of the Kingswood Agricultural Reformatory School. Bristol—H. C. Evans, Clare Street. 1854.

† For the sake of brevity, we must employ this word to convey a somewhat complex idea.

adjudicators. Twenty-eight essays were sent in; and of the four best, the two now printed seemed so nearly equal in merit, that Lady Byron generously desired that a prize of £150 might be given to each.

There are grave objections to prize essays. Some of these apply to the system of prizes altogether; and yet this is engrained with our habits from childhood to death; indeed, many regard heaven itself as a prize. A distinction may be made between prizes designed to elicit mere literary excellence, and those intended to incite to the investigation of great moral questions: and then we may consider the effect of the latter on the competitors and the public. Since many compete, many must be disappointed; and only those should devote themselves to the task to whom the outlay of time and labour will not be ruinous. In this case, the unsuccessful writers will have acquired a great deal of information and valuable thought on a great subject, and, *mentally*, will be far richer than if they had never written. In this respect, their position will be far different from the crowds of applicants for offices which they never obtain, and whose minds are impoverished, and tempers soured, in vain canvassing for patronage; and, *pecuniarily*, they will be as well off as the host of moral reformers who willingly spend their time and strength in gratuitous advocacy,—better off than if they had been tempted by their zeal to rush into print, with the fate that usually awaits those who write upon themes that are not yet popular. As regards the public, we are disposed to think that as good a book will be written to meet the approbation of two or three experienced judges, as to secure the patronage of the trade. It has been suggested that, if an essay is wanted, a person of known competence had better be engaged to write it; but the benefit of the present system is, that it likewise interests and brings forward those of hitherto unknown competence. This is exemplified in the volume before us. Miss Cornwallis had already shewn her interest on a kindred subject by her “Philosophy of Ragged Schools,” and, as she tells us, eagerly caught at the opportunity the prize afforded of once more expressing her sentiments on this important subject; whilst Mr. Micaiah Hill is, we believe, a new labourer in this field.

The book is pleasantly printed, but has one very serious omission; it has no index or table of contents. The oversight is the more remarkable, because Mr. Hill's Essay, which occupies three-quarters of the volume, has a marginal heading to each paragraph. A work of this kind is not to be read through, like a fiction, and then thrown aside: it should be retained for reference: those who are studying the subject should know at once where to find the important facts it records: and the annoyance from this omission is so great, that we should advise the publishers to prepare an index for the remainder of the edition.

Mr. Hill's Essay contains a great deal of well-methodised information. He quotes very largely from Mr. Mayhew's curious and elaborate work on "London Labour and the London Poor," deriving from it statements which he has verified from independent sources. Plint on Crime, Dr. Hamilton on Popular Education, &c., furnish him with many striking passages; and the speakers at the first Birmingham Conference, and others who have had much experience, have supplied him with details, of which he has wisely availed himself.

His first chapter contains a general inquiry into the present state of juvenile delinquency. In the next chapter he considers its sources; and when we read them, we feel that the wonder is, not that there is so much, but that there is so little, of what law calls crime. The loathsome *vice* here revealed is far more terrible than many of the *offences* of which the law takes cognizance. The child who has been brought up in a respectable home, may do, has done, what is penal; but we trust that there is enough that is good within him to secure his recovery. When, however, we read of the bestial condition of these outcasts, we feel that, so far from its being probable that their home influences will reform them, the scenes of their dens and lairs are more frightful than the unprincipled exertions of their skill in the streets and shops of our towns! Mr. Hill says that he paused before he transcribed these statements:

"Indeed, he had erased and re-inserted the paragraphs to which reference is made. Vice exists. To be known—to be felt—it must be fearlessly, though cautiously, exposed. In removing physical nuisances, temporary inconvenience, though under aggravated circumstances, cannot always be avoided. It is a question worthy of serious consideration, whether *one* great cause of juvenile depravity is not the complete seclusion and isolation courted and enjoyed by the dregs of the population? If this be undeniable, are we to assist in throwing an impenetrable veil over pollution? Will not the privacy sought by the vicious be conceded by the virtuous, if contact with filth and squalor is shunned, or the face is turned away from scenes that disgust and pain?"—Preface, pp. x, xi.

We think he has done right. We have a strong conviction that it is in itself evil to be familiar with evil; that evil must be overcome by good; that we are not the better for brooding on our own sins, or those of others; that the continual sight of moral or mental deformity has a deforming influence. These pages may therefore do harm to those whose highest motive in reading them is curiosity. But when we are not mere observers or even philosophical analysers of evil, but have an earnest desire to remove it, we seek to find the *truth*—truth, which, however painful, is *good*: we look on vice, not as its shameless spectators, still less as accomplices, but as saviours. We commend these descriptions of the lost to those who would seek and save them.

The history of young criminals is various. Some few are children of parents deemed respectable, who have not obviously neglected them: many more owe their fall to the want of parental care: some were hurried into vice by the uncounteracted force of hereditary depravity,—they seem born in sin, nursed in it, bred in it: from some, the State itself has withdrawn their parents, undeserving of the name,—in one year, 1586 children, the offspring of convicted criminals, have been thrown into our work-houses (p. 150), and it can scarcely be doubted that some of these afterwards found their way to our gaols: others might have been happy, but for the bereavement of Providence.

“‘It has been calculated that there are 700 orphans committed to the prisons of our country every year;* that there are 2000 committed of those who are deprived of one of their parents; so that there are nearly 3000 annually left without their natural guardians to guide them into the paths of duty, and to instil into them the practice of virtue.’ * * * It is heart-rending to know that the child, suddenly deprived of his natural protectors, wanders in our streets begging and crying, till becoming acquainted with persons of his own age who are professed beggars or reputed thieves, he is led to the lodging-houses resorted to by these wretched children, and there victimized and initiated into the mysteries of crime. ‘To the gang of young thieves (says Mr. Mayhew), a *new* boy, who is not known to the police, is often (as a smart young pickpocket, then known as the ‘Cocksparrow,’ described it to me) a *godsend*.’”—Pp. 48, 49.

The Cornish wreckers used to pray God, it is said, for wrecks; and the thief’s *godsend* is an innocent child. It is obvious that vice must increase, whilst not only the love of assimilation, but obvious interest, leads to the ruin of these children; unless the same motives prevail in those who have diviner interests, leading us, for the obvious good of society, to assimilate these children to a higher model, and to regard the depraved as *godsend*s, crossing our path that we may have the privilege of leading them back to the Father.

From the third chapter—“Children, their Moral Claims upon the Community”—we extract the following passage:

“We have permitted weeds to grow and *flower*, and then *incautiously* uprooted the nuisance. The evil seemed repressed; but the very act shook out seeds and scattered them far and wide; and in a few short weeks or months, we found that we had multiplied indefinitely the number of criminals. Vice is let alone till it has become insufferably odious. So long as it torments the hapless child, and consumes only the few around him, without affecting, visibly, society at large, we heed it not. But let those whose indifference has, in great measure, begotten the evil, once feel the inconvenience thus arising, and down comes the arm of the law to crush the unfortunate offender. Society allows the child to commence its ruin by what is called vice. Our

* Miss Cornwallis informs us that there are 17,230 orphans now receiving out-door relief (p. 388).

authorities are instructed to place him among companions in prison, who shew him a more rapid progress of demoralization than he is acquainted with; and then the whole nation lifts up its foot and crushes the worthless and miserable wretch. The child, to our knowledge, is deteriorating; nay, as it has been pointed out, certain functionaries are employed to watch the process, under express directions not to interfere. *The law secures him this liberty.* It guarantees a certain period to sink, as fast and as deep as circumstances, his own passions, or the cruel ingenuity of his destroyers, will permit. A certain point reached, and, like a Hindoo taking his dying relative to the muddy and filthy waters of the Ganges, the police conduct him to prison to complete his moral death!"—Pp. 93, 94.

He next proceeds (pp. 96—173) to consider "Preventive Measures." The parents themselves are, as far as possible, to be reformed; better social arrangements are to be made; a practical and moral as well as intellectual education is to be provided; nor is healthful recreation to be neglected. This chapter contains some most encouraging statements of the good already effected by those whose hearts have been open and their energies active, and is deserving of very attentive study.

In his fifth chapter he shews, from unimpeachable testimony, that the gaol does not check juvenile crime, but increases it,—that it is "abortive and ruinous;" and (chapter vi.) considers what is to be done with those children who, from the neglect of their parents and of society, have by their vagrancy or offences come under the obvious jurisdiction of the law. He gives some account of what has been done by Ragged and Industrial Schools, and by the institutions at Redhill, &c., and furnishes an interesting summary of the practice of our continental neighbours and the United States. We observe an error in page 263, where he states that the Reform School at Westborough, America, contained 300 inmates of both sexes, and quotes the speech of Mr. R. L. Carpenter at the Birmingham Conference as his authority. Mr. C. said, that he saw "many of the inmates making shoes; others were knitting and garment-making; others baking and cooking; others were busy at the wash-tub and ironing; all under the instruction of proper officers, male and female." [Report of Conference, p. 77.] The inference was not therefore unnatural that there must be girls, though boys only are mentioned. Such, however, is not the case. A Reform School for girls at South Boston did not answer expectation; and many of those who approve of Westborough, think it undesirable that a large number of girls should be similarly collected: domestic habits will, they think, be best secured by apprenticing these girls to respectable and benevolent families,—a plan which is more feasible in New England than here. We may incidentally mention, that the experience of Massachusetts shews us that no system of State education can at present supersede the necessity of Reformatories. Nowhere is excellent instruction more freely

rendered than there; yet nowhere is there a deeper conviction that there is a large class of children, and those the most dangerous to the community, whom these schools do not reach. A certain degree of respectability seems as necessary to attract children to such schools, as to draw their parents to church or chapel. To multiply schools or churches, and to elevate the character of the instruction there, will improve the community at large; but another agency is needed for those who are sinking into ruin.

The last chapter (pp. 277—320) contains a "Statement of Objections, Obstacles, and indispensable Qualifications." No doubt there are risks and dangers in this great enterprise, and God teaches us the greatness of the evil by the difficulty of the cure; but when it has been proved so clearly that the present mode of dealing with young criminals positively increases the evil, society stands convicted as itself criminal, and must be roused to repair the wrong.

The second Essay, by Miss Cornwallis, contains fewer statements of facts, and is comparatively short, but it abounds in important thoughts. Believing that happiness is the normal state of man, and that the Divine laws are for our good, she desires so to interpret those laws, and to co-operate with them, that the path of virtue may in due time be the way of pleasantness. "Until we give the mind general culture enough to enable it to reach to the spirituality of religion, we may introduce a superstition, but we shall not make a Christian. There is no greater mistake than to suppose that the religious, intellectual and industrial progress of a nation can be separated." (P. 414.)

Her objection to the vindictive mode of punishing *children* is founded on a wide principle:

"The attempt to banish sin from the world by statute laws, and legal pains and penalties, has never yet succeeded, and never will; exactly because it is from man's interior self that his good and evil proceed; and until the heart is changed and the motives purified, though coercion may prevent the overt act for a time, the disposition remaining the same, the action will be repeated as soon as the agent is free."—P. 413.

Our limits prevent us from giving an account of this Essay. In default of any index or division into chapters, the reader will find a summary of part of it in pages 367, 368. Miss Cornwallis shews very forcibly, with an array of historical facts, that no nation is safe that contains within it a large number of the neglected and depraved; and that, where great empires have been subdued, internal decay has previously disabled them. One sad evil of war is, that it increases the number of our domestic foes. Lawlessness at home is cherished by conflict abroad. All our energies seem directed to external dangers, and we forget the formidable army which is already on our shores, and from which neither our dwellings nor our persons are safe. The number of *children* who are already criminals, or training to be such, is

computed at 150,000 (p. 350),—a fearful number ! They cannot be met and crushed in one decisive battle, or exterminated in a successful campaign. The number in prison forms as small a proportion as do prisoners of war to the whole host ; and whilst prison may weaken the strength of the soldier, it but increases the skill of the thief. We are convinced that, should this nation now be called by a feeling of duty or honour to engage in war, and make this an excuse for the neglect of our most dangerous classes, no success abroad can compensate for prolonged vice and consequent spoliation and wretchedness at home.

In contrast to the evils occasioned by neglect, Miss Cornwallis gives a very interesting account of a village in Kent, which had been remarkable for drunkenness and ill-conduct. The rector, the only gentleman of the place, established and superintended a school, free for labourers, with a charge for those of higher means, to which almost every child was sent ; and there were “ *three* offenders, not one of whom has come a second time within the grasp of the law, out of a population of between 1000 and 1200, in forty years” (p. 379), giving an average eight times better than Warwick, which, in 1847, was the least criminal county.

A pertinent illustration is drawn from the treatment of lunatics. Pain and fear were employed as the only specifics, and failed : love, patience and skill have been tried of late with great success. It is often difficult to draw the line between insanity and vice ; both arise from an unsound mind, or from want of moral discipline, or from physical malady ; and if the criminal were treated as wisely as the maniac, society would be great gainers. (See pp. 362—367.) It has been objected that, if love prompts the remedy, crime will become more attractive ; but we are yet to learn that persons are anxious to become mad, in order to be confined in the most cheerful of madhouses. Yet there seems more ground for the fear that, in the case of children, *parents* who are willing to be relieved from their responsibility, will be indifferent to their career, if it may result in their committal to a Reformatory. To the worst class of parents, however, a Reformatory is more objectionable than the gaol ; the period of confinement will generally be longer ; instead of a week, a month, or three months in prison, the boy will at the school be detained till a cure is either effected or found hopeless. All this time they lose the plunder which they exacted from him ; and, when he is at large, he is no longer their associate, but in the opposing ranks of honest labour ; and we know that, practically, so far from parents being uniformly anxious to have their children taken from them to be placed in these institutions, there is often great difficulty in obtaining their consent. It has been proposed that parents should pay for the support of their criminal children : we approve the suggestion, though there is no more

reason why they should pay for them in the *school* than in the *gaol*. It is desirable that there should be some legislative enactment on this point. The managers of Kingswood, who have sought voluntary payments from the parents, have found some who were the most able, the least willing to contribute.

Miss Cornwallis recommends that each district should be made answerable, after the old Saxon plan, for the crime it has nurtured; and that the parish overseers should pay the cost of the child's reformation, to recover it if possible of the parents, or of the father, in the case of illegitimate children, who are peculiarly liable to fall into neglect and crime (pp. 385—390).

The Report of the Kingswood School, which has just appeared, contains the results of a brief but important experience. Our readers are aware that its managers, Mr. Russell Scott and Miss Carpenter, hold religious opinions similar to our own: they have, however, selected their teachers without inquiry into their creed: the children themselves attend, we believe, at the Methodist chapel on the premises, and the subscribers are of all sects and political parties. It is carried on in the spacious premises formerly occupied by Wesley's school, and was opened with five boys and two girls on the 15th September, 1852: it now contains sixteen boys and thirteen girls. A statement is given of the past and present condition of the children, who vary in age from eight to sixteen. Though the boys and girls are under the same roof, they are kept apart, except, indeed, that working with the girls we saw one little fellow, thus described:

"A most wild and restless little child, trained to habits of depredation from a very early age, had been fifteen times in the hands of the police, in consequence of his skill in plundering the tills of shops, &c. He is now under control, and it is hoped may do well."

Of another child, recently admitted, aged nine, it is said:

"He not long since attempted to hang himself in gaol, in consequence of the fear of an impending whipping. He has often been in prison, but seems disposed to do well."

Of the four oldest girls, we learn:

"These girls, who had been six or eight times in prison, and were of an extremely low character, were sent on a conditional pardon from the Crown. Without the power of legal detention thus given, it is doubtful whether they could have been kept in the establishment. They have already manifested great improvement, and it is hoped that, if they remain a sufficient time, they may be prepared to earn an honest livelihood."

This brings us to what we believe is to be one provision of the proposed Bill. At present there is no legal hold on children, except on those who come under this conditional pardon, that requires the consent of the parents and the culprit, which is not always obtainable. Young offenders should not be sent to the gaol for a single day; that day, before the time has come to put them into

their allotted ward, has in many cases been fertile in deadly mischief. They should be sent at once to Reformatories, duly inspected and approved by Government, before the prison brand has defaced them; and power should be given to the managers to retain all children under their charge as long as they and the inspectors may deem it necessary. This authority is the more needed, because these schools ought not to have the physical restraints of gaols; and, from the restlessness of criminal children, they are peculiarly liable to be tempted to run away, even when their reason tells them that they could not be better off.

Parliament must also provide for the support of these schools. Those who have the greatest objection to State endowments for education, allow that it would be absurd to complain that the money now wasted in keeping children in prison, should be employed in keeping them out of it. At the same time, we may give the voluntary system a fair trial. Let individual enterprise and zeal establish Reformatories, and when it can be proved that they can effect a cure, let Law give up its captives to the good Samaritans who shall convey them to a safe abode and *take care of them*. It is encouraging to see how much support the Kingswood School has received; yet the annual subscriptions form but a small part of its income; and it is not right that any of those energies, which ought to be devoted to the internal management of such establishments, should be expended in canvassing for their maintenance.

Beside the School at Kingswood, there are three or four other private Reformatories. They are beneficial in themselves, still more so in the exemplification of a fundamental principle. The Christian mode of treating crime is only beginning to be understood. If there are at least 150,000 children who want reforming, such institutions should be counted by hundreds. They should not be all conducted on one plan, or be open to all culprits indiscriminately. If the simple fool, the idiot, the melancholy, the doting and the maniac, are not to be all herded together, neither are those who are led to beggary and crime through very different causes. Teachers will be found to have various qualifications, and to be best adapted to deal with children of various temperaments. After all, in the case of girls especially, we should be glad to find that there were throughout our land thousands who would put to the proof the vast powers of individual influence; who would set their hearts on reforming some one child; and who would not rest till her home was a safe and virtuous abode for her. Those who laboured thus might or might not succeed; but they would at all events learn some of the sources of evil, and be ready to help those who would remove them.

We cannot conclude without expressing the hope that our readers will watch for the introduction of the Bill to which we

have referred, and, if they approve it, that they will support it by petitions and appeals to their representatives. It is encouraging to see the progress of the public mind on the subject; but still the labourers are few. To increase their number, to stimulate their zeal, and to guide it with knowledge, is the object of the Essays we have quoted.

R. L. C.

MONUMENT TO THE REV. JOHN KENTISH.

THE congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, have recently erected therein an elegant mural monument to the memory of the late Rev. John Kentish, who had been for Fifty Years their Pastor. It has been designed and executed by Mr. Peter Hollins, the eminent sculptor; and is placed on one side of the pulpit so as to correspond with the monument on the other side, designed and executed by his father, to the memory of Dr. Priestley. It consists of an altar-shaped tablet, of Greek character, bearing a three-quarter face medallion portrait of Mr. Kentish, the likeness of which is considered as remarkably faithful; and having above the tablet the arms of the deceased, with the motto, "Irrupta copula;" the whole being on a ground of Dove marble. Beneath, on a slab of white polished marble, is the following very appropriate and beautiful inscription from the pen of the Rev. John Kenrick:

THIS TABLET IS CONSECRATED TO THE MEMORY

OF THE REVEREND JOHN KENTISH

BY THE CONGREGATION OF WHICH HE WAS THE PASTOR FOR FIFTY YEARS
IN TESTIMONY OF THEIR LOVE GRATITUDE AND VENERATION

DEVOTED TO THE WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

HE QUALIFIED HIMSELF FOR THE DISCHARGE OF ITS SACRED DUTIES
BY THE CULTURE OF EVERY BRANCH OF KNOWLEDGE WHICH MIGHT ENABLE HIM
TO ESTABLISH THE AUTHORITY TO ILLUSTRATE THE MEANING
AND TO ENFORCE THE PRECEPTS OF THE WORD OF GOD

HIS PUBLIC SERVICES WERE CHARACTERIZED BY FERVENT DEVOTION

SCRIPTURAL SIMPLICITY AND AFFECTIONATE EARNESTNESS

IN INSTRUCTING THE YOUNG IN ADMINISTERING COUNSEL AND CONSOLATION
HE UNITED THE AUTHORITY OF THE TEACHER WITH THE KINDNESS OF A FRIEND

BY HIS ENLIGHTENED ZEAL FOR FREEDOM KNOWLEDGE AND ALL THE GREAT
INTERESTS OF MAN

BY HIS LIBERAL SUPPORT AND WISE ADMINISTRATION

OF NUMEROUS INSTITUTIONS OF PUBLIC BENEFICENCE

HE GAINED THE GRATEFUL ESTEEM OF HIS FELLOW CITIZENS

AS AN ADVOCATE OF WHAT HE BELIEVED TO BE THE GENUINE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

HE WAS CANDID ZEALOUS AND CONSISTENT

HUMBLY ENDEAVOURING TO RECOMMEND THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS

BY A LIFE AND CONVERSATION BECOMING THE GOSPEL

HE WAS BORN AT ST ALBANS JUNE 26TH 1768

BEGAN HIS MINISTRY IN THIS CHAPEL JANUARY 23RD 1803

DIED AT PARK VALE NEAR THIS TOWN MARCH 6TH 1853

BRIEF MEMOIR OF REV. JOHN SEDDON, OF WARRINGTON, WITH
SELECTIONS FROM HIS LETTERS AND PAPERS. No. I.

WE have been favoured by Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool, with the use of a considerable number of the letters and papers* of Mr. Seddon, the projector of the Warrington Academy. We have made a selection from them, and now prefix to the first portion of them a brief memoir of this active and excellent man.

JOHN SEDDON,† minister and tutor at Warrington, was born at Hereford, Dec. 8, 1725. His father, Peter‡ Seddon, was the minister of the Presbyterian congregation in that city, having removed thither from Ormskirk in the year 1719. Respecting the school education of John Seddon, nothing is known. Probably he was prepared for the academy by the instructions of his father. From him also, we may suppose, he received a bias towards a free and liberal system of theology. That bias had been communicated to the father's mind in the academy of Dr. Benyon, of whom it is said that, striking into a better system of instruction than that of his predecessors, "he made the Bible his only system of theology, and its genuine exposition he thought was the most profitable divinity lectures he could read to his pupils; to that only was he devoted, and not to any man's hypothesis." The liberal tendencies of Mr. Seddon, of Hereford, may be safely concluded from his choice of a tutor for his son, which fell on Dr. Rotheram, of Kendal, of whom it was recorded, that "he was an impartial lover of truth," and "encouraged the most free and unbounded inquiry after it in every branch of science." John Seddon entered the academy at Kendal in 1742, where, amongst other pupils, he found Mr. Robert Andrews (afterwards minister of Platt and Bridgenorth), Mr. John Holland and Mr. Richard Godwin (afterwards of Gatacre), with whom he contracted a warm and enduring friendship. From

* They were accidentally rescued some twenty years ago by the late Mr. H. Bright from destruction in a chandler's shop. Many, it is believed, had already perished in this ignominious way.

† The Monthly Repository (V. 428, VIII. 289) contains many interesting particulars respecting Mr. Seddon, communicated by the Rev. W. Turner. In some few particulars, the present writer has seen reason to depart from the statements of this now venerable man; at the same time, he desires to express his sense of the value and interest of Mr. Turner's biographical articles. In preparing the present article, the Editor has received much valuable information respecting the Seddon family from Rev. Franklin Baker, of Bolton, who is about to favour the public with an historical account of the Presbyterian ministers at Bolton, one of whom was Robert Seddon, the ejected minister.

‡ The name is so given in a list of the Hereford ministers prepared by the late Walter Wilson. Mr. Turner supposed the subject of our memoir to be the son of John Seddon, a pupil of Frankland's academy at Rathmel in 1690-1. It is, however, stated in Josiah Thompson's (MS.) Account of Academies, that Mr. Seddon, of Hereford, was a pupil of Dr. Benyon; and the name occurs towards the end of the list, which may be supposed to contain only the names of students at Shrewsbury. The Shrewsbury academy, under Benyon, existed only two years, 1706-1708.

Kendal he proceeded to the University of Glasgow, where, in company with the three friends just named, he enjoyed both the instructions and the friendship of two distinguished Professors. The first was Dr. Francis Hucheson, the Professor of Moral Philosophy, whose brilliant career was now drawing near to its close. For seventeen or eighteen years he wielded great influence over his successive pupils, presenting the truths of philosophy to their understandings by the aid of a conversational eloquence which won attention and conviction by its nature, freedom and power. To Dr. Hucheson the University of Glasgow owes the separation of instruction from a dead language. Notwithstanding considerable classical attainments, he introduced the practice of lecturing in English. The lectures of Dr. Hucheson took a wide range, including, in addition to Moral Philosophy, Natural Theology, Jurisprudence and the Evidences of Christianity. Seddon and his three English friends were favourite pupils of the Professor, who was attracted to them by their intelligence and cultivation, and also by their connection with the liberal Dissenters, he himself, previously to his election to the Moral Philosophy chair in Glasgow, having conducted for nine years an academy for Dissenters in the city of Dublin. To a young and generous mind, the philosophical system of Dr. Hucheson must have presented many charms. In opposing what may be called the *selfish* theory of virtue, and in making Benevolence the central sun of his ethical system, he made his appeal to the conscious dignity of human nature and the sense of moral beauty. The philosophical and æsthetic impressions made on the mind of Mr. Seddon by this excellent Professor were never effaced. The other gentleman to whom he was indebted for valuable instruction was Dr. Leechman, the candid and liberal Professor of Theology. He was only just beginning his University career. With equal courage and success, he had resisted and thwarted the theological bigotry of the extreme Calvinistic party in the West of Scotland, who endeavoured by a cry of heresy to drive him from the chair to which he had been elected, after an angry struggle, only by the casting vote of the Lord Rector. What Mr. Seddon saw in Glasgow of the workings of theological intolerance, would teach him the value of the liberal principles he had imbibed at home and at Kendal, and this impression would be confirmed by the habitual wisdom, justice and candour of his instructor in theology at Glasgow. Dr. Wodrow, in his excellent Life of Dr. Leechman, has given an interesting description of the mode pursued by this eminent man in conducting his Divinity class, from which one or two extracts may properly be given, in order to shew what were the intellectual and theological influences which moulded the views of Mr. Seddon, and prepared him for his ministerial duties:

“The Professor gave a lecture of a full hour’s length regu-

larly four days every week, during a six months' session; and, besides this, spent an hour on Friday, and sometimes another on Saturday, in hearing the discourses composed by the students on particular texts or portions of Scripture prescribed to them. After these were delivered, he made his *observations* on each of them, in a manner that shewed the most accurate attention, commending with judgment, or censuring with delicacy. * * * On Monday, the Professor gave a critical lecture on the New Testament, reading the passages in the original language; adverting, when it was necessary, to the different senses put upon the Greek words by the commentators, without naming them; to the connection; to the particular probable views of the writer or speaker, and the situation of the minds of the hearers; to any ancient customs or historical facts necessary to illustrate the passage. Thus he exhibited the precise sense of it, answered at the same time the principal objections, and intermixed occasionally short pertinent observations.—The diets on Tuesday, Thursday, and sometimes Friday, were spent in what is called Polemical Divinity. Considering how little this teacher had of the spirit of a polemic, his accurate knowledge of all the principal controversies which have agitated the Christian world was surprising; and the judgment and candour with which he conducted this delicate and dangerous part of his business was pleasing, at least to every liberal mind. * * The text-book the Professor used was Pictet's Shorter System, afterwards changed for Ostervald.—He touched slightly the scholastic, useless questions, marking them as historical facts, with the circumstances or events that gave rise to them.—The principal thing aimed at in these lectures was to give his theological students a view of the great controversies which have divided Christians. To each of these he introduced himself from something he found in his text; and, laying aside his book, he treated the subject in the following manner, in two or more lectures, according to the importance or celebrity of the question. He began with a history of the controversy, and of the chief men who figured in it. He stated the point in dispute with sufficient precision; not only the opposite opinions of the two parties, but the difference of opinion in the men of the same party. Then, which was the main thing, he gave a candid view of the arguments on both sides, from reason and especially from Scripture. Here his sound judgment led him to put aside everything trivial, and to bring forth the very strength of the arguments, as well as of the difficulties, on each side; particularly the most plausible passages of Scripture urged in proof of the opposite opinions, the criticism by which the force of those texts was supported or evaded, with the answers, replies and duplies made by the parties in the course of the debate. In fine, justice was done to both parties, not only in this representation of their opinions, with the grounds of them, but also by

admitting their disavowal of the absurd and dangerous consequences charged on each by their antagonists, exhibiting the important points of Christianity mutually acknowledged by both. After all, the question remained undecided; that is, the hearers were left entirely to the exercise of their own judgment, and directed to the means of further inquiry. No dictatorial opinion, no infallible or decisive judgment on any great controverted point, was ever delivered from that theological chair. After the point had undergone a full discussion, none of the students yet knew the particular opinion of this venerable Professor, in any other way than by the superior weight of the arguments which he had brought under their view: so delicately scrupulous was he to throw any bias at all upon ingenuous minds in their inquiry after sacred Truth. * * *

“As if this had not been enough, when he gave the students his parting advices at the end of the session, he warmly recommended candour and continued diligence in the search after truth; modesty and caution in forming their last judgments on points about which wise and good men had thought differently; advised them long to retain the character of inquirers, and to keep their minds open to new light and evidence from every quarter. He shewed how wise and lovely this was in all, especially in young minds; and painted, on the other hand, in strong colours the indecency of rash, presumptuous judgments, and the fatal effects of bigotry.”

We have been induced to extract this account of Dr. Lcechman's mode of teaching divinity, because his principles and spirit largely actuated the body of English Presbyterians in the 18th century, under the influence of ministers who had been his pupils at Glasgow. In addition to the names of Seddon and his three friends, we may specify Mr. Davenport (of Chowbent and Hindley), Mr. Urwick, Mr. Armstrong (of Bath), Mr. Geo. Walker, Mr. Cappe, Mr. John Houghton, Mr. John Dean (of Bradford), and Mr. Richard Hodgson (of Doncaster). The theological system adopted by Mr. Seddon was Arianism, which was in all probability that held by his Theological Professor.

Returning to England on the close of his University education, Mr. Seddon quickly found a sphere for the exercise of his well-cultivated talents, being elected minister of the Presbyterian congregation of Warrington. Early in 1745, this highly respectable society had lost by death a pastor (Dr. Charles Owen) whose services they had enjoyed for about forty-eight years. Towards the close of his ministry the congregation had rebuilt their chapel. Earlier in the century they numbered about six hundred persons.

The Rev. John Seddon was ordained minister at Warrington, December 8th, 1747. Shortly after his settlement, the congregation received an important accession from the Church of England in the family of the Percivals. Mr. Joseph Percival, a

merchant resident in Warrington, died, as did his wife, in 1743, leaving an orphan family of four children. In Elizabeth, the eldest daughter, her two sisters and Thomas Percival, her only surviving brother, found an able and affectionate guardian. In the mind of this excellent lady, probity, benevolence and piety were conspicuous. "Possessed of an understanding of more than usual energy, her thoughts were often and deeply conversant with subjects relating to religion; and her judgment in these matters was fortified and improved by theological study." Of such a convert Mr. Seddon might well feel proud. The biographer of Dr. Percival, after stating that "soon after the period of Mr. Seddon's establishment in Warrington, the family of Mr. Percival was induced to quit communion with the Church of England, and to espouse the tenets of Protestant Dissent," adds, that "the sacred studies in which the older part of its members had deeply engaged, seem to have wrought a change in their religious opinions, accompanied with corresponding sentiments in those around them. The motives of their conversion were unquestionably sincere; and the period of declaration might be produced or hastened by a rational preference for the discourses of a liberal divine of Arian persuasion." Great and beneficial was the influence exercised by their newly-chosen pastor over this interesting family. He gave private instructions to Thomas Percival, who in after-life obtained a not undistinguished rank as a physician, a writer on morals, and a philanthropist. These instructions were especially in ethics and moral science. The "piety and benevolence which dignified the character" of Mr. Seddon, and which gained for him a reputation "extended widely beyond the sphere of his pastoral connections," made a deep and lasting impression on the mind of his pupil. To his influence may no doubt be in great measure attributed young Percival's hesitation about subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, which being confirmed by his own careful doctrinal investigations, led to his abandoning his purpose of entering the University of Oxford. When Dr. Percival became a parent, and felt the importance and responsibility of the instruction of the young, his mind reverted with gratitude and affection to the "counsellor of his youth and the friend of his riper years;" and in his well-known work, entitled "*A Father's Instructions*," he thus sketched the character of his friend: "He possessed a solid judgment and enlarged understanding, and, what is rarely found united with them, a lively imagination, a quick conception, and refined taste. His knowledge was rather general and extensive than profound; but his ideas were so well arranged, that he had them always at command, and could converse on every subject with ease, propriety, and even masterly skill. His pulpit compositions were rational, nervous and pathetic; his delivery was manly, animated and affecting. Strongly impressed himself with the divine truths

of religion and the sacred obligations of morality, he enforced them on the minds of his audience with an energy irresistibly persuasive. An assemblage of virtues constituted his moral character. His heart was tenderness and humanity itself; his friendship warm, steady and disinterested; his benevolence universal, and his integrity inviolate. Nor were these the untried virtues of retirement; for he was early engaged in the active scenes of life, and assaulted with difficulties which required the utmost fortitude to surmount. He was not deficient in those exterior accomplishments which add charms to virtue and make goodness shine with superior lustre. His manners were polished; his address was easy and engaging; and his conversation sprightly, entertaining and instructive. As a gentleman, a scholar, a preacher, a companion and a friend, he was almost without an equal.*

Mr. Seddon married, in 1757, Miss Hoskins, whose father had been equerry to Frederick, Prince of Wales, and possessed a considerable fortune. The share which fell to Mrs. Seddon's lot was unsuccessfully invested in some calico-printing works near Stockport. To this circumstance, and to some disagreements between Mr. Seddon and his wife's brother, and to a painful misunderstanding between himself and one of the tutors at Warrington, Dr. Percival probably alludes when speaking of "difficulties" which tested his fortitude.

Soon after the commencement of the second half of the 18th century, the attention of the liberal Dissenters was anxiously directed to the provision for educating the future ministers of their churches. Hitherto the academies at which young men destined for the ministry had been educated, had, though occasionally aided by grants from educational funds, been chiefly carried on as the private speculations of individual ministers. Their locality had been generally decided by the accidental residence of the principal Tutor. Possessing neither regular income nor extrinsic government, they fell to pieces on the disability or death of successive conductors. During the last portion of the 17th century, the academy of Mr. Frankland had supplied the Nonconformist churches of the North of England with a succession of able ministers. For some years afterwards, an academy existed at Attercliffe. That had now been closed for twenty years. At Findern and other places in Derbyshire, an academy had flourished for half a century under Mr. Hill and Dr. Latham. The death of Dr. Rotheram had closed the doors of the academy at Kendal, and that of Dr. Latham those of the Derbyshire academy. Nearly about the same time, Northampton had lost its distinguished head, Dr. Doddridge, and Daventry had scarcely established its reputation under Dr. Ashworth. The time was clearly come for the re-establishment, and on a broader and more

* Works of Dr. Percival, I. 33, 34.

secure basis than had hitherto been attempted, of an academy in the North of England. For several years the scheme was meditated, and by slow degrees public opinion in its favour was formed and brought to a common centre. In no one did the proposal find a more energetic promoter than in its author, Mr. Seddon. Of that, the correspondence now for the first time printed, and the original minute-book of the Warrington Academy, furnish sufficient evidence. One of his associates in the scheme, the Rev. Philip Holland, afterwards bore testimony to the large share he had in the plan, and to "the concern which he ever expressed for its support, honour and success,—the indefatigable pains which he took for this purpose,—the indifference which he shewed to fame or censure, to good or evil report, so that he might serve the general designs of the institution." The difficulties in establishing the new academy were great. Many had to be consulted and conciliated. Amongst both ministers and laity, accustomed to the exercise and expression of individual judgment, differences of opinion were inevitable. Then there were local and personal prejudices and prepossessions. Without prudence and good-temper on the part of the promoters, alienation and opposition would have arisen in quarters where good-will and active support were essential. It would far exceed our limits if we were to attempt even a sketch of the history of the Warrington Academy. Those who are desirous of pursuing the subject, may do so by referring to Mr. Turner's valuable narrative in the *Monthly Repository*, Vol. V. We shall content ourselves with describing briefly the share Mr. Seddon had in the origin and conduct of the academy.

In July 1754, the first announcement was made of the subscriptions, which were gathered chiefly in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham and Warrington. It was not, however, till June 1757, that the first general meeting was held at Warrington. Friends of the scheme were present from Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Gatacre, Chowbent and Bolton. Mr. Seddon was supported by Messrs. Thomas Turner, Thomas Leigh, John Hart and Ellis Bent, who it may be supposed were members of his flock. Mr. Seddon accepted the appointment of secretary. In the first appointment of Professors, Mr. Aikin and Dr. John Taylor, Mr. Seddon took a cordial part. When the academy opened, he, together with the other Tutors, placed his books at the service of the pupils. When a library was formed, consisting, in the first instance, chiefly of the books of Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Seddon undertook the office of principal librarian.

It is well known, and has been more than once stated in print, that Dr. John Taylor's connection with the academy was not happy. Between himself and Mr. Seddon there were on many subjects differences of opinion and taste. Dr. Taylor disliked the Huchesonian philosophy, to which Mr. Seddon was ardently

attached. On the subject of the atonement, their language differed probably more than their sentiments. On the subject of free prayer and liturgical forms, although their practice in public worship was identical, their opinions and taste differed widely, and the differences were exaggerated in controversial discussion. Coming late in life to the duties of a Professor, and at a time when his health and strength were on the decline, it is probable that Dr. Taylor found it uncongenial with his feelings and habits to enjoy only a divided authority.

Early in the history of the institution, the Committee passed a vote desiring the Tutors to meet frequently for friendly consultations on such particulars as concerned the good of the academy and the useful and honourable discharge of their respective stations. By the same vote, Mr. Seddon was authorized to attend these Professorial meetings, and, as secretary of the college, to give with freedom his opinion on all questions that might occur. Collisions soon occurred between the Tutor in Theology and the Secretary. Complaints were freely scattered by the former among the friends of the institution. In July 1760, twelve of the more zealous friends of the college, among whom was Mr. Seddon, united in a respectful address to Dr. Taylor, asking him to state the grounds of his uneasiness. This he did, levelling his charges against Mr. Seddon. The matter was freely discussed, and the minutes of the college contain a statement of the case, *pro* and *con*. Nothing deserving of record was substantiated against Mr. Seddon, although it is not improbable that there had been imprudences of speech and little provocations, growing out of a sense and love of power, which the Professor could not brook. But in no respect did the confidence of the Trustees in Mr. Seddon appear to be diminished by this painful dispute. Very soon after its occurrence, Dr. Taylor was removed by death. It must ever be remembered to his honour that, in order to promote the important scheme of an institution for the education of young men for both the ministry and civil life, this distinguished scholar quitted an honourable and tolerably lucrative post at Norwich, and a congregation very devotedly attached to him. The merit will be appreciated by those who have realized the amount of sacrifice involved in a similar act of disinterested zeal, of very recent occurrence, in our own body.

The discussion between Dr. Taylor on the one hand, and Mr. Seddon and the Trustees on the other, proved, as Dr. Priestley stated in his Autobiography, disastrous to the institution. His family and intimate friends took up the quarrel, and withdrew all support from the institution. In London and elsewhere much prejudiced feeling arose, which not even personal explanations and documentary evidence always succeeded in allaying.

Subsequently to the death of Dr. Taylor, Mr. Aikin was appointed successor to the vacant Theological chair, and Mr. Seddon,

in company with his friend Mr. Philip Holland, was deputed to wait on Dr. (then Mr.) Priestley at Nantwich, and offer to him the chair previously filled by Mr. Aikin. His acceptance of it, and subsequent residence in Warrington during six years, was the occasion of much delightful intercourse and a warm friendship between them. The survivor, Dr. Priestley, thus described his relations to his colleagues at Warrington:—"In the whole time of my being at Warrington, I was singularly happy in the society of my fellow-tutors, and of Mr. Seddon, the minister of the place. We drank tea together every Saturday, and our conversation was equally instructive and pleasing. I often thought it not a little extraordinary that four persons, who had no previous knowledge of each other, should have been brought to unite in conducting such a scheme as this, and all be zealous Necessarians, as we were. We were likewise all Arians, and the only subject of much consequence on which we differed was respecting the doctrine of atonement, concerning which Dr. Aikin held some obscure notions. Accordingly this was frequently the topic of our friendly conversations."—*Life of Priestley* (Rutt), I. 38, 39.

In 1762, Mr. Seddon was deputed to visit London and other places to ascertain how far the promised subscriptions to the academy might be relied on,—to give explanations and to remove prejudices. On the removal of Dr. Priestley to Leeds, in 1767, the chair of History, Oratory and Grammar, was pressed by the Trustees on Mr. Seddon, who cheerfully undertook the arduous duties, accepting in return for them the small pittance of £50 per annum. At the same time he was appointed to the office, then first created, of Rector *Academiæ*, designed to be annually elected, with a view to the superintendence of college discipline and the morals of the students. He continued to discharge his Professorial duties during the short remainder of his life. The lectures which he drew up are still extant, in four quarto MS. volumes, in the library of Manchester New College, and evince habitual careful preparation for his class. Two volumes contain lectures on the Philosophy of Language and Grammar, including also an account of the origin of Alphabetic Writing. The other two volumes contain a very full and elaborate treatise on Oratory.

Next to the academy at Warrington, there was another subject which occupied, in the later part of his life, a degree of attention sadly disproportionate to its importance. It was the controversy respecting free prayer and liturgies which was carried on amongst the Presbyterian ministers of Lancashire, of which so lucid an account was given by Mr. Henry Taylor in the *Monthly Repository*, XVII. 20—24. Though himself practising free and extempore prayer, Mr. Seddon not only felt that there was no objection on principle to the use of a liturgy, but, assisted* by

* Various accounts have been given of the authorship of this volume. Mr. Henry Taylor states that it was really composed by Mr. Seddon. Dr. Kendrick,

his friends Godwin and Holland, drew up and published "A Form of Prayer and a new Collection of Psalms for the use of a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters in Liverpool." To this subject many allusions will be found in the letters which we propose to print in a subsequent No. of the C. R. The composition of this work was the consequence of an application, made to several of the Lancashire ministers towards the end of the year 1760, by "a society of Protestants at Liverpool," who further described themselves as persons "who do not entirely approve of the present method of conducting the public devotions in Dissenting congregations, and who cannot comply with the terms of conformity to the Established Church, and are desirous to introduce a rational liturgy into their form of worship." The instructions added respecting the desired liturgy are, though somewhat tinged with philosophical and necessarian views, on the whole excellent,* as the following extracts will shew :

"Having no particular sentiments to express but such as are common to all rational dependent beings and Christians, they would wish to have no ambiguous, disputable opinions introduced into the public service, but that the whole may be plain and intelligible to the meanest capacity.

"Creeds and articles of faith of human invention, they think should have no place in a public liturgy, as those things have no tendency to promote either Christian unity or a spirit of devotion.

"The language they could wish to have as plain as possible, but suited to the peculiar character in each distinct branch of devotion ; in every part grave, manly and perspicuous, and nowhere falling into the flat style of narration.

"They think the principal part of their time should be taken up in praise and thanksgiving, and that the other branches of devotion should be comparatively short.

"They desire that the petitioning part may be so cautiously expressed, as not to lead the people into mistakes about Divine assistance ; but that they may be led to think that prayer is chiefly to be answered by the effects it produces in their own tempers and lives."

The Forms published are in correspondence with these instruc-

of Warrington, in his recently published "Profiles of Warrington Worthies," assigns the authorship to Mr. Seddon. But in the advertisement to the volume, there is this distinct statement : "These compositions are not the hasty production of any one person, but the joint labour of several, improved by the judicious remarks of many." Mr. Turner also states, on the evidence of papers in his possession, that the third service was Mr. Holland's. (*Mon. Repos.* V. 428.) There are services for morning and evening, and a third service, to be used either morning or evening at the choice of the minister. The prayers are solemn and devout, and couched in appropriate and forcible language, and will bear a comparison with many forms still in use.

* The whole letter will be found in the Preface of the *second edition* of Dr. John Taylor's *Scripture Account of Prayer*.

tions. It appears, from a note to a pamphlet entitled, "Remarks on the Christian Common Prayer-Book," that, on the 6th of January, 1762, Mr. Seddon met, by previous agreement, the friends of the new liturgy, to the number of three or four and twenty persons, consisting both of Dissenters and Seceders from the Church, at the Merchants' coffee-house in Liverpool, and there exhibited to them the work.

The proceeding appears to have excited an amount of alarm and prejudiced disapprobation, which, now that the use of liturgies is in so many cases practised by some of the least compromising of the liberal Dissenters of England,* appears truly astonishing. In the note already alluded to, it is stated that Mr. Seddon's proceeding was without the concurrence or approbation of his brethren in Liverpool. The writer then proceeds, in no very candid spirit, to remark: "How consistent the part which he then acted is with his profession as a Dissenting minister,—how prudent in regard to his known connections with a seminary of learning,—and how favourable its tendency to promote the interests of real religion among the Protestant Dissenters, there and in other places,—we leave to himself to evince to the satisfaction of those who are more especially concerned. But he will not resent it as an indignity to be assured that it is the sentiment of some of the most judicious and experienced of his brethren, that this novel and indigested attempt to introduce a stated liturgy into the Christian churches of that denomination, will be generally opposed by ministers and people; and that, unless the second performance should be far superior to the first (which, indeed, is said to be the work of a person whose taste and studies were not the most CONGENIAL to it), the zealous patrons of this scheme, so threatening to peace and liberty, will probably be greatly disappointed in their sanguine expectations from it."

It is strange that the writer of this note did not perceive that the infringement on peace and religious liberty was on the part of those who censured and opposed the effort of certain Christian worshipers to make the best provision in their power for their own spiritual edification. Had the attempt been made to force the new liturgy upon unwilling hearers, it would have deserved the indignation which, under the actual circumstances, it so little merited. Dr. John Taylor and Rev. John Breckell entered the lists against the new scheme,—the former in his "Scripture Account of Prayer," which he lived to prepare for the press, but not to publish;† the latter in "Remarks upon a Letter to a Dissenting Minister concerning the Expediency of Stated Forms of Prayer." Without further notice of these pamphlets, we may

* Liturgies are now in use at Essex-Street and Portland-Street chapels, London, and those of Brook Street, Manchester, Exeter, Swansea, Dukinfield, Bury, Dean Row, Stockport, Macclesfield, and some other places.

† The Preface is dated Feb. 25, 1761, just eight days before his death.

express our regret that the whole of Dr. John Taylor's was not composed in the gentle and pathetic spirit of its closing paragraph, in which he alludes to his return to his native county towards the close of his days,—to the high motives which had induced him to quit Norwich for Warrington,—and to the peaceful and happy terms on which he had previously lived with many excellent and eminent persons.

Mr. Seddon resisted every provocation to reply to the attacks on the liturgy. In this he shewed equal forbearance and wisdom; for the continuance of the controversy would have certainly proved injurious to the interests of the academy at Warrington. He was not the author of the "Letter to a Dissenting Minister," although the authorship was imputed to him by Dr. Taylor; but he had a hand in the reprinting of that pamphlet in a second edition at Warrington.

This may be the proper place for observing that, except his share of the liturgy, Mr. Seddon committed nothing of his own to the press. In 1753, he was invited by his brethren in the ministry in the province, to print a sermon which he had preached before them at their annual meeting, and had transcribed it for the press. But on its being submitted to the critical revision of his friend Mr. Andrews, of Platt, that candid and friendly critic admitted that his first impression of the value of the sermon was not sustained, and dissuaded Mr. Seddon from proceeding with it to the press.

The "congregation of Protestant Dissenters in Liverpool" alluded to in the title-page of the Prayer Book, erected, in 1762-3, a new and handsome chapel, called from its shape the Octagon, in Temple Court, off John Street and Matthew Street.

The founders of this congregation were chiefly members of the two societies at the chapels in Benn's Garden and Kay Street. They first applied to Mr. Seddon to become their minister. At the same time he received an application from the Presbyterian congregation at Poor Jewry Lane, London, to be the afternoon preacher in the pulpit recently become vacant by the death of Dr. Benson. After serious consideration, he declined both these invitations, influenced in part by attachment to the society at Warrington, and still more by the strong desire personally to continue the superintendence of the academy. Dr. Clayton and Mr. Kirkpatrick were the ministers whose services were ultimately engaged at the Octagon. The undertaking did not produce the effects anticipated, and the chapel was closed Feb. 25, 1776. The building became the property of a clergyman, who converted it into a church, and it was known until 1820 (when it was pulled down to make way for some improvements designed and effected by the Corporation) as St. Catherine's.*

* See some papers on the Liverpool Churches and Chapels, by Rev. D. Thom, D.D., published in the Papers of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire.

Mr. Seddon was one of the founders of the valuable and flourishing society, the Widows' Fund, for the counties of Lancaster and Chester. Warrington may very fairly dispute with Preston the honour of being the cradle of this society. The first conversation on the subject took place at Warrington on the occasion of a meeting of ministers held there, May 18, 1762. Additional interest is given to the circumstance by Dr. Priestley's receiving on that occasion ordination from the assembled ministers. Mr. Seddon was not then present, being engaged in London in behalf of the academy; but he was one of the ministers who assembled at Preston, May 18, 1763, when, after listening to Dr. Priestley's noble sermon on the Duty of not Living to Ourselves, the society was formed. Mr. Seddon was one of the original Trustees, and was the first Secretary, and the duties of the Treasurership were fulfilled by a member of his congregation, Mr. Hart. Another institution which Mr. Seddon assisted to form, and which has continued to this day to benefit the town of Warrington, was its Public Library, established in 1758. He was appointed the first President. Dr. Kendrick claims for this institution the distinction of being "the *first* Free Library and Museum* thrown open to the public in this country, under the Act 8 and 9 Vict. c. 43."

The varied usefulness of Mr. Seddon was brought to a sudden close early in the year 1770. He was seized when on horseback by apoplexy. He fell to the ground, was conveyed home, and in eight hours was a corpse. He retained his consciousness and exhibited proofs to the last moment of his tender and affectionate disposition. He was buried in the chapel at Warrington, and his funeral sermon was preached by his fellow-student and friend, Mr. Holland, of Bolton. It will be found printed in his Sermons, Vol. II. p. 197. On the grave-stone in the aisle there is this inscription:

"Here lieth the body of the Rev. JOHN SEDDON, who died January 23, 1770, aged 45."

A monumental inscription prepared by the hand of Dr. Percival does not appear to have been used, but it is given in its author's Works:

"Near this place lie the remains of the Rev. JOHN SEDDON, Minister of this Congregation, to which he was endeared by a faithful and affectionate discharge of the Pastoral office; by his cheerful piety, universal benevolence, extensive knowledge, and temperate zeal for civil and religious liberty. He died Jan. 22, 1770, aged 45. Heu! quanto minus est cum reliquis versari, quam tui meminisse."

Mr. Seddon left a widow and (we believe) a widowed mother, but no children. The Warrington Trustees, as a mark of the

* The Natural History Society of Warrington (which was formed Nov. 23, 1838) was on this occasion amalgamated with the Library.

sense they entertained of his great and long-continued services to the academy, respectfully presented to the widow a ring of the value of ten guineas.

The only portrait of Mr. Seddon we have had the opportunity of seeing is a small *silhouette* preserved by Dr. Kendrick in his "Profiles of Warrington Worthies." It exhibits features regular and handsome, the head more than ordinarily massive, giving the impression that the intellectual powers were both strong and active. His bearing and address were always those of a gentleman. His elocution was clear and forcible. When objections were made to Priestley's reading lectures on the subject of Oratory, of which it was said that he was incapable of giving a practical illustration, the reply made was, that he might direct the attention of his pupils to Mr. Seddon as an excellent oratorical model.

The distinguishing excellence of Mr. Seddon was disinterested public spirit and a desire for practical usefulness, seconded by indefatigable industry and habits of business. The intimate personal friend of such men as Dr. Percival, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Aikin, must have been a man of high moral worth and of corresponding intelligence. He had his infirmities, such as a love of power and impatience at whatever thwarted the object then in his view; but these notes become invisible to the eye that fairly contemplates the honourable consistency of his life, the high objects to which he directed his talents and influence, the warmth and purity of his friendships, and the large amount of good which he did to the religious denomination amongst whom he spent a useful and not unhappy life.

The first letter is from a member of the Bayley family, who, together with the Gaskells and the Butterworths, continued (as Mr. Heywood has observed in a note in Newcome's Diary, p. 42) to be "for nearly eighty years the great support of the Cross-Street congregation." The writer of the letter which follows might be that Daniel Bayley who in 1717 married Elizabeth Gaskell, the aunt and early guardian of the famous Lord Clive. The first two names appended to the document which constituted the foundation of Manchester College belonged to the same family.

Daniel Bayley, Esq., to Rev. John Seddon.

Manchester, March 14th, 1753.

Rev. Sir,—I ought before this time to have acknowledged your favour, inclosing the scheme for the erecting and maintaining an academy in this place.

As the thing is quite new to me, and out of my usual way of thinking, I am at a loss what judgment to form of it. All I can say in general is, that I wish well to such a design. But is it not too large an undertaking? Should not London lay the foundation, and we be only

supplemental? Is not so populous, so pleasurable, so divided, and so dear a place as Manchester, very unfit for the seat of the Muses? These are but hasty thoughts, and perhaps not well digested; but as they very naturally occurred to me, I could not forbear to mention them. I apprehend none but Dissenters (or a very few only) would contribute to support a rival to the publick Universities; and if so, the weakness of the founders must be considered, and the difficulty of supporting and conducting so grand a scheme, which will certainly require the nicest management, and be attended by a vast expence. You will excuse my free thoughts, which I would offer with much diffidence, and a due regard to superior judgments.

I am, Sir, your most sincere friend and most humble servant,

DANIEL BAYLEY.

There is of the date Dec. 4, 1753, a letter somewhat similar from Mr. Peter Touchet, of Manchester, one of a family that for nearly 150 years professed Presbyterian Nonconformity in connection with Cross-Street chapel. He advises Mr. Seddon to avoid the specification of Warrington as necessarily the place for the establishment of the academy, and mentions that Ormskirk was by some preferred to Warrington, as a more convenient site. He also suggests that one Professor may be found competent to undertake both Theology and Moral Philosophy. The next letter in the collection is from the representative of an ancient and respectable Lancashire family, once settled at Warton Hall.

Mr. John Mort, of Chowbent, was the friend of Priestley and Mrs. Barbauld. He died in 1788. Mr. Henry Toulmin published a *Short View of his Life, Sentiments and Character*. To him were addressed these pleasing lines by the muse of Mrs. Barbauld:

“Happy old man! who stretched beneath the shade
Of large grown trees, or in the rustic porch
With woodbine canopied, where linger yet
The hospitable virtues, calm enjoy’st
Nature’s best blessings all; a healthy age
Ruddy and vigorous, native cheerfulness,
Plain-hearted friendship, simple piety,
The rural manners and the rural joys
Friendly to life. O rude of speech, yet rich
In genuine worth, not unobserved shall pass
Thy bashful virtues! for the Muse shall mark,
Detect thy charities, and call to light
Thy secret deeds of mercy; while the poor,
The desolate and friendless, at thy gate,
A numerous family, with better praise
Shall hallow in their hearts thy spotless name.”

“Our old parson,” of whom Mr. Mort speaks, is the noted “General Wood,” or “Woods,” who eight-and-thirty years previously had put himself at the head of his congregation, and

marching to Preston to resist the progress of the Pretender, had assigned to him the custody of the ford of Penwortham. This brave old man continued minister of Chowbent more than sixty years, and died there, Feb. 20, 1759, at the advanced age of 87.

Mr. John Mort to Rev. John Seddon.

Chowbent, Dec. 17, 1753.

Dear Sir,—Though I am one of those that think themselves oblig'd to encourage, and according to their abilities contribute, to set on foot our academy scheme, and, if you cannot possibly pay us a visit, shall try what subscriptions will be rais'd here, yet must desire you'll favour us with your presence on St. John's-day, which is the 27th inst. As we have a lecture on that day, Mr. Wood begs and hopes you'll give us a sermon. Mr. Tho. Dixon, of Bolton, is usually with us on these days, and other ministers. As there are several young gentlemen of spirit at Bolton that are certainly well-wishers to the scheme, and of considerable abilities, you'll find your account in spending a day or two at least with Mr. Dixon amongst them. Generally the young men amongst us are best affected to the scheme, but then it is not in their power to do much, and I know not whether small subscriptions will be taken. I am afraid our richer neighbours will not be over zealous in the affair. By all means come amongst us; 'twill put life into the cause. Make our house yours; and pray let us know by bearer whether we may depend on your company, and whether our old parson may have the comfort of a sermon from you. Am, your most obedient servant,

JNO. MORT.

Jo. Wilson, Esq., of Rivington, to Rev. John Seddon.

Rivington, Dec. 22nd, 1753.

Sir,—I received yours on Tuesday last, and am glad you have made such progress about the new intended academy. As Lord Willoughby is so near a neighbour, would it be proper for me to subscribe before his Lordship? otherwise, leave it to your choice to put me down four or five guineas, whether you please, per ann. I'm fearfull you won't meet with much more encouragement hereabouts; yet it may not be improper to try. Was I to ask 'em, and anything was subscribed, it would be looked upon as a favour done me, for which reason only I hope you'll excuse me asking them. Have you made any application to Chorley? The two Mr. Cromptons and Mr. Crook are likely to subscribe handsomely, if not others. Pray have you wrote to any one at Derby, Nottingham or Chesterfield? There are several at each place likely to promote it much. I am wishing you the compliments of the season, together with success in the affair. Sir, your most humble servant,

J. WILSON.

The next letter, undated, is from Rev. R. Godwin, whose whole ministerial life was passed at Gatacre. He died at the house of Mr. Holland, of Bolton, Aug. 1787, of an apoplectic fit. See a beautiful sketch of his character in M. Rep. V. 428.

The Rev. Josiah Rogerson had been a pupil of Mr. Jollie at Attercliffe, and settled first near Wirksworth about 1707, and removed to Derby in 1715. Although Mr. Godwin noted in

him chiefly the old man's jealousies and fears, Mr. Rogerson was throughout life a friend of learning and religious liberty.

The library of Mr. Stubbs referred to became the property of the Trustees, and now forms a part of the excellent library of Manchester New College. Rev. Samuel Stubbs was educated for the ministry at Findern by Dr. Latham, with whom he was a favourite pupil. He was settled at Longden, near Litchfield, and was more respected for his learning and private virtues than admired as a preacher. Dr. Latham states that he had often pleased himself with the thought that he should find in Mr. Stubbs a suitable successor to himself in his plans of education. He was prematurely cut off, May 13, 1753. His funeral sermon was preached by Dr. Latham. (See Mon. Repos. VIII. 86, IX. 321.)

Rev. Richard Godwin to Rev. John Seddon.

Dear Mr. Seddon,—I am just now alighted at the George in Warrington, and have the pleasure to find your horse in good health and condition. On Wednesday last, I got to Leek at seven o'clock, and, though I was but a mile and half from my uncle's, durst not venture any further that night; which happened very fortunately, for as soon as I came into the inn, I found Mr. Rogerson, then on his road from Ollerton to Derby, with whom I had a great deal of conversation. I find in him the old man's jealousies, suspicions and fears. He threw the common objections before me, and obliged me to repeat those answers which have been made a thousand times. The academy scheme he allowed to be a good one, but seem'd to question its being practicable. He intimated that the Dissenters enjoyed many privileges at present, and wisht that no steps might be taken, by grasping at too much, to endanger all; and, contrary to my expectation, talkt pretty much in the strain of some of our senior brethren nearer home. I should not have given myself the trouble to have prolonged the conversation, but with a view so far to conquer his prejudices as to make a friend of him with my coz. Stubs at Derby, who, he told me, has not yet, he believes, disposed of his brother's books. He has promised me to use all his interest to prevent the disposal of them 'til the merits of the new academy be better known; and has undertaken, particularly, to assure him that the gentlemen concerned in this scheme wil give him all the security the nature of the thing wil admit of, that the books shal answer the generous design of his deceased brother. I shall wait with some impatience for Mr. Rogerson's letter, which I expect in less than three weeks. I wish your meeting with your brother may be more comfortable than my fears suggest. My cold is much the same as when I left Birmingham. Pray write as soon as anything of importance occurs in town.

I am, your affectionate friend,

R. GODWIN.

P.S. Pray my duty to Lord Willoughby, if you think proper.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND MR. HIGGINSON'S SPIRIT OF THE BIBLE.

SIR,

I have been pleased with much in the recent work of Mr. Higginson, though I think the first title, "The Spirit of the Bible," not the most appropriate. But I am by no means satisfied with the chapter on Daniel. I shall take the liberty of laying a few of my reasons before your readers, and this I do with great respect for the author.

It might suggest, I think, to all believers in the Bible, that an objection to the genuineness and antiquity of one of the books of the Old Testament, which originated with Porphyry, a heathen unbeliever of the third century of the Christian era, is derived from a highly suspicious source, and the argument comes much too late to interfere with the settled belief of the Jewish church in Judea and Alexandria. It is evident that Porphyry *could* not have admitted the book to be prophetic, consistently with his rejection both of Judaism and Christianity. His own words are, "Daniel does not foretell things future, but at the most makes some conjectures about them." Now this state of opinion would be inconsistent in a believer in Christ, who finds the Saviour plainly citing Daniel as a prophet. I am aware that the notion has become common among the theologians of Germany, some of the most distinguished of whom, though they may be useful as critical interpreters (and I am grateful to them in that character), must be unsafe guides in whatever affects the truth of divine revelation. I take leave to cite the words of the cautious Lardner:—"Porphyry was in the wrong to deny the genuineness of the book of Daniel, which had always been received by the Jews, as we perceive from the books of Maccabees, and Josephus, and from our evangelists, not now to mention any later writers. To dispute the real age of Daniel and the genuineness of his book, is arbitrary and unreasonable; as if a man should deny that Virgil and Horace lived in the time of Augustus, or wrote those works which, with general consent, are ascribed to them and received as theirs. The book of Daniel is as genuine as any of those histories which Porphyry made use of in his work against the Christians."

To descend to particulars. 1. It is said by our author that "the description of events announced in Daniel is more minute than is usual in the other books of Hebrew prophecy." Thus, although we know that Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel have their respective peculiarities, and the same is true of many of the other prophets, yet because Daniel, whose circumstances materially differed, has his peculiarities too, this must be held as evidence that he is to be excluded from that class of writers. I see no good reasoning in this, and do not believe that any can be shewn.

2. "The book of Daniel is indeed more like a rapid emblematical history, &c., than a foreshadowing of those events." Mere *likeness* will surely not be regarded as sufficient ground for rejecting evidence to the contrary, which in the case of the other prophets is held to be satisfactory.

* Vol. VII. 417.

3. "This suggestion would date the production of the book about A.C. 165." Now, since we know, at the latest, that the Septuagint translation was finished by the year B.C. 130, and that Daniel is placed by it before the minor prophets and the Apocrypha, it may have been translated quite forty years before, and is placed by the Jews of Alexandria among the prophets unhesitatingly. This fact implies that it was previously admitted into the Hebrew canon; and since its insertion there in the same class with the Psalms, which contain many prophecies, was a mark of high respect, and that ever since, down to the time of Christ, it was received as canonical, I cannot but think the supposition of 165 for the date of this book, argues a degree of credulity which neither Jewish nor Christian belief requires, and shews how easy of credence that very class of men may be (among whom I do not include Mr. Higginson) who are the loudest at times to express their scepticism.

4. "At any rate, it is far less confusing to the mind to read the description," &c. Exactly the same words might be and doubtless are used by the Deists of the day. "It is far less confusing to the mind" to read the New Testament as a book of natural occurrences, than to imagine it to describe such wonders as giving sight to the blind and raising the dead. The argument, such as it is, is equally valid in both cases.

5. "It is remarked that the book of Daniel is full of Chaldæisms." I venture to say that the case is here misstated. There is a *Chaldee portion* of the book, but the book itself is not full of Chaldæisms; and the portion which is in Chaldee furnishes strong internal evidence that the faith of learned Jews and Christians, for more than two thousand years, is the true faith. It would have been strange, indeed, if a book, written in circumstances in which we know that Daniel was placed, should not have contained a large portion in the Chaldee dialect. And our author candidly admits that "this does not necessarily prove any later period than that of the captivity itself," thus giving up an argument which, instead of being against, is indeed strongly in favour of the genuineness of the work.

But, 6, our author remarks, as another argument for a late date, that "the book of Daniel has *Greek words* which cannot be accounted for on any other supposition than the results of Alexander's conquests, when Greek infused itself into the thought and language of the Jews." If this means of Palestine, I think the description is overcharged; for though the Greek language was known and spoken by many Jews in the time of our Lord, yet the only Gospel which was expressly written for the Jews was composed in the vernacular Hebrew, and exhibits very little indeed of Greek influence. But the question is not concerning Jews in Palestine, when *they* may have become acquainted with a few Greek words, and these the names of foreign musical instruments, but when these words may have been first adopted in Babylon, "the city of the Chaldee excellency," "the centre of civilization," with whose inhabitants there was much commercial intercourse with those of their neighbours to whom Greek was common. I venture to challenge those who are best acquainted with ancient customs, including trade and commerce, to undertake to prove that no opportunity of such introduction could have preceded the time of the conquests of Alexander. This objection, arising from the use of four Greek words, evidently

appears to our author of no mean weight; though by various learned writers, especially by our own Priestley, it had been discussed long before, and the argument shewn to be of little worth. But it happens that even by one of the leading German critics, the younger Rosenmüller (who takes a side opposite to the genuineness of the book, and for the obvious reason that he admitted the existence neither of miracle nor prophecy, and therefore, as in the case of Porphyry, considered the distinct specification found in Daniel too precise for unassisted human conjecture),—by this eminent critic, the argument from the Greek words is altogether abandoned; and he candidly grants, that if the four technical words be of Greek origin,* he could not deny that they might have been used in writings of the date of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, referring to the very ancient commercial intercourse which had existed among the nations, and citing Berosus and Strabo as authorities. Now this being a question of pure learning, I am disposed to place the authority of Rosenmüller far higher than all our modern compilers, and venture to think that it completely overthrows their argument.†

7. Our author speaks of the doctrine of angels, &c., “as now first appearing in Jewish literature,” as if the peculiar circumstances of Daniel and his long residence in Babylon were not sufficient to account for this difference. I pass over the slur about “legends,” and hasten to a conclusion, noticing the last reason suggested by our author why we must depart from the faith of learned Jews and of all Christians till almost our own time (for the scepticism of Collins, who shared in the doubt of Porphyry, must not be imputed to Christian believers), arises from the position which the book of Daniel occupies in the Hebrew canon, i.e. in the third division of the sacred books, called in that language, *Chetubim*, and in Greek, *Hagiographa*, i.e. *Sacred Writings*.

Our author, as might have been expected from his accuracy of learning and intellectual culture, has avoided errors into which some on his own side have fallen; yet has he not altogether escaped confusion. In pointing out that our book occupies a place in the last division of the Hebrew Scriptures,—in which, however, what some regard the most ancient, the book of Job, finds a place, and the universally admired books of Psalms and Proverbs, in part the production of holy men and prophets of early times,—yet seems to intimate that this very circumstance indicates inferiority in the apprehension of the Jews, and that it would follow thence that it is of later date than Malachi; though nothing is more notorious than that the Hebrew canon was settled and determined by Ezra the scribe, the editor of the Hebrew writings, who was himself contemporary with that prophet. I see in the foreign residence of Daniel a cogent reason why his book was among the last which

* Dan. iii. 5.

† It is not a little remarkable that our modern compilers, in catching at the apparent evidence of a late date, derived from a few Greek words, have overlooked the positive assertion of Grotius, in loco, that “already before the time of Daniel, large colonies of Æolians and Ionians, led into Asia, had scattered there the words of their own language;” and we have reason to know that Asia Minor was celebrated for its attention to music and musical instruments. A learned friend, in a recent communication, has suggested to me that “we may take it for granted that Greeks visited Babylon and Nineveh and other oriental cities from the earliest times.”

reached the hands of Ezra; but that he received it at all so as to include it in the canon, is perfect evidence against the Porphyrian notion of the late date of Daniel, and furnishes an insurmountable proof of the invalidity of that opinion.

I am almost ashamed, in conclusion, to point out the glaring ignorance of the writer on Daniel in the Penny Cyclopædia, who evidently mistakes the *Hagiographa*, or Holy Writings (which constitutes one division of the Jewish Scriptures, and has always been received by the learned of that people as of high authority), for the *Apocrypha*, and fancies its position in the LXX. to be a proof of the "uncanonical" character of the book of Daniel; though its admission into the *Chetubin* in the Hebrew Bible, corresponding to the *Hagiographa* of the Septuagint, is the most distinct proof of the contrary. It is to be hoped that future writers in Encyclopædias, if not professed theologians, will endeavour to avoid such blunders; and it will be well if Christian ministers among us, standing in so very different a position from that of German Deists, should be more careful to avoid arguments which might suit the latter, but which come with an ill grace from those who believe both in miracle and prophecy, and heartily receive the truths of Divine Revelation.

B. M.

MR. MACAULAY'S SPEECHES.

SIR,

IN the notice of the recently published collection of "Speeches by Mr. Macaulay" contained in your last number (p. 115), you observe that his speech on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill differs considerably from the report in the volume of Debates published by the United Committee who promoted the Act. With reference to the particular speech which, as you state, now appears in an improved form, and "contains some phrases, if not entire passages, which were not actually spoken," I can confirm your statement. The proof-sheets of the speech, when printed from the short-hand writer's notes, were sent to Mr. Macaulay, with a request that he would kindly revise them. He did not oblige the Committee to the full extent of their request, though he pointed out one or two inaccuracies (which were corrected), adding that the report was tolerably faithful. So much for this particular speech.

With regard to the general question of the propriety and good taste of the publication by orators of their own speeches revised and amended, there are some very pertinent remarks in the review of this collection in the *Athenæum* of 17th December last, in which you will probably concur. Amongst other things the reviewer observes: "Some public men are not anxious to have their exact words recorded. The curious in these matters will find an instance in the Preface to the six-volume edition of Canning's Speeches. At the time of the Reform Bill, a first-class political celebrity (since deceased) made a great speech, of which he undertook to supply a report to a particular journal. On the report being furnished to the office, a reporter compared the statesman's copy with his stenographic notes, and declared to his editor that the right honourable speaker's copy was 'decidedly doctored.' 'Print according to your notes,' was the editor's instruction; and vehement was the orator's wrath on finding himself fastened down to the very words which he had actually employed, but which he wished to have forgotten."

Mr. Sheil (who was, I suspect, the very same political celebrity here alluded to) furnished the Committee with the MS. of his speech on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. This differed very much from the spoken oration, and the Committee thought it right to adopt the short-hand writer's notes, yielding to the right honourable gentleman so far as to make one or two variations in diction, in deference to his desire to tone down the composition, which, though highly applauded in delivery, seemed somewhat too florid for critical perusal.

How far such alterations, either by correction, omission or interpolation, are permissible in an independent publication, I will not argue. My object is to vindicate the general accuracy of the volume of Debates. Mr. Gladstone, Sir William Follett, and several others of the speakers in both Houses, favoured the editor by looking over and correcting the proofs at the time. But if every speaker were, at the distance of ten years, to touch up and republish his speech as he would fain have it *now* reported, no doubt there would be a most woful discrepancy between the verba dicta and the litera scripta.

London, 20th February, 1854.

C. F. T

MONUMENT TO THE MEMORY OF JOHN POUNDS, THE PHILANTHROPIC SHOE-MENDER OF PORTSMOUTH.

SIR,

FRIENDS from a distance, visiting the grave of the philanthropic Shoe-mender, John Pounds, in our chapel-yard at Portsmouth, having occasionally expressed their surprise and regret to find that no grave-stone had been placed on it to mark the spot, our Sunday-school teachers some time since agreed to take the requisite steps for erecting a suitable monument to his memory. Considering that John Pounds, from the commencement of our Sunday-school to the time of his death, had made a practice of sending to it his most improved scholars, and had all along enjoyed attending our annual school festivities, we felt that this pleasing tribute of respect might be well confided to the teachers to complete. With this view, quiet little collections have been made among their nearer friends and acquaintance; but it is believed that many persons elsewhere would wish to add their mites to so interesting a work, if they knew of it; and therefore, though we feel that it will be the most in character with the good man himself to do it in as unostentatious a manner as possible, I beg to communicate these particulars, in compliance with the wish of our excellent teachers, for publication in the *Christian Reformer*, if you, Sir, see no reason against it. We have already placed four pounds in the Savings' Bank towards the object. The surplus, should there be any, after erecting a suitable monument on the grave, is to be appropriated to the founding of a Library, to be called "John Pounds's Library," adapted to the instructive entertainment of young persons, which will be preserved in the school building, and to which admirers of this friend of the poor may at any time contribute, and thus continue to invigorate a truly characteristic memorial to an indefinite futurity.

Donations may be addressed to the Treasurer of the High-Street Sunday-school, Portsmouth.—I am, Sir, yours sincerely,

Southsea, Feb. 20, 1854.

HENRY HAWKES.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNIVERSITY REFORM.

Lord John Russell and his colleagues of the Aberdeen Administration have ventured upon the much-needed but difficult task of University Reform. The University of Oxford, as most needing such reformation and less sensitive to public opinion than her sister University at Cambridge, is the subject of the Bill proposed and brought in to the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone. It consists of 55 clauses. The principal objects of the Bill are—

1. To do away with the present governing body of the University, called the Hebdomadal Board, consisting exclusively of all the Heads of Houses, and to substitute in its place a new governing body, to be called the Hebdomadal Council, to consist of the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors and two members named by the Chancellor, also of six Heads of Houses, of six Professors, and of six members of Convocation, all elected by the Congregation of the University.
2. To constitute afresh the elective body called the Congregation, to consist, in addition to all the chief officers of the University, of the Professors, Tutors, Public Examiners, Masters of Private Halls, and all resident Members of the University habitually engaged in the study of some branch of learning or science. In the election by the Congregation of the Hebdomadal Council, the rights of the minority are preserved by the regulation that where there are three vacancies, each member shall give only two votes, &c.
3. To do away with oaths binding to secrecy and to resisting changes in the statutes of the University or Colleges.
4. To give to members of Convocation the power of opening private Halls for the reception of students, within one mile and a half of a central point in Oxford.
5. To throw open to general competition (with a few specified exceptions) all fellowships, scholarships, exhibitions, and other places of emolument payable out of the revenues of the University.
6. To secure the due examination and certifying of candidates.
7. To do away, under certain circumstances, with the necessity of vacating fellowships from not being in orders.
8. To limit the enjoyment of fellowships, after the first year, to resident members engaged in tuition in the

University, or holding a living or curacy within three miles of Oxford, and to non-resident members performing certain specified duties.

9. To give both to the University and to the Colleges the power of making statutes in respect to discipline of the University, to the management, studies, income, &c. of the Colleges.
10. To give to the University the power of altering trusts.

That this measure, if passed by the Legislature, will be productive of good,—that it will tend to emancipate the University from the despotism of a few narrow-minded men, and promote both the efficiency and accessibility of existing Colleges, and throw open the benefits of University learning to many now excluded from them, we do not doubt. Some complain that the whole of the recommendations of the Commissioners have not been embodied in this Bill; but considering the amount of prejudice which exists in many quarters against interference by the Legislature with these “time-hallowed institutions,” it is probable that the Government have ventured as far as they expect to secure the concurrence of Parliament. One great omission and defect in this Bill is, that it does nothing to secure the rights of Protestant Dissenters in respect to a national institution like the University of Oxford. We are happy to learn, however, that this important subject will not be lost sight of in Parliament. The following excellent Memorial, signed by Mr. James Heywood, Mr. Thomas Thornely, and 100 other Members of the House of Commons, was presented to Lord J. Russell on the 3rd of March, by a deputation consisting of several Members of Parliament, Professor Baden Powell, of Oxford, and J. J. Sylvester, Esq., of Cambridge.

That your Memorialists are grateful to your Lordship for the advice which, as Prime Minister, you gave to Her Majesty in 1850, for the appointment of Royal Commissioners to inquire into the state, discipline, studies and revenues of the Universities and Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge; and they are glad to learn that the Reports of the University Commissioners have led to the preparation of Bills, which your Lordship intends shortly to place on the table of the House, for an alteration in the constitution of the ancient Universities, a modification of the rules

regarding College Fellowships, and an application of some portion of College property to the general purposes of each University.

Your Memorialists desire to call your Lordship's notice to the fact, that the ancient Universities have long been recognized as national institutions; and that the Royal Commissioners describe the Colleges connected therewith as having now become such.

Your Memorialists beg to remind your Lordship, that by the volume of the census on religious worship of 1851, the number of the members of the Church of England cannot be estimated to exceed 6,000,000—the total population of England being 17,927,609; and it is hardly necessary to observe, that the above numbers cannot justify the exclusive enjoyment, by the members of that Church, of institutions designed for the benefit of the entire community.

In the opinion of your Memorialists, strict justice, sound policy, and the principles of religious liberty, would alike require the admission of any of Her Majesty's subjects, duly qualified by intellectual attainments, to all the advantages of these venerable seats of learning, without the imposition of any religious test.

Your Memorialists, however, are compelled to remind your Lordship, that at Oxford a copy of the Thirty-nine Articles is inserted at the commencement of the matriculation-book, and that young students are thus compelled to subscribe their formal assent to a number of theological propositions which they cannot have studied; and that further, this form of subscription excludes a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects from the advantages of the collegiate education there given; while at Cambridge, though no obstacle is imposed to matriculation, none but members of the Church of England are admitted to degrees or fellowships.

Your Memorialists rejoice to observe that among the suggestions of the Oxford Commissioners, the two following are submitted to your Lordship's consideration:

1. The Royal Commissioners recommend the practice of using a selection of prayers in the College chapels at Oxford, rather than the whole morning and evening services of the Book of Common Prayer, as evidently more suitable to the age and character of the students; and they remark, that "authority, if needed, may doubtless be obtained for such a deviation from the Act of Uniformity, as would permit a short form of prayer to be used in the College chapels."

2. The Oxford Commissioners express

their conviction, that the imposition of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles at matriculation, "in the manner in which it is now imposed in the University of Oxford, habituates the mind to give a careless assent to truths which it has never considered, and naturally leads to sophistry in the interpretation of solemn obligations;" and, they further notice, that the subscription to the three Articles of the thirty-sixth Canon at graduation in Oxford, is a form especially intended for the clergy of the Church of England at their ordination, and not for lay graduates.

And your Memorialists would further beg to call your Lordship's notice to the fact, that the Cambridge Commissioners advert to the admission of persons who are not members of the Church of England to degrees at that University, in arts, law and medicine, as a concession to public opinion, which is left by them to the effect of time, to the wisdom of the Legislature, and to the gracious consideration of Her Majesty.

On these grounds, and encouraged by these indications of opinion, your Memorialists respectfully request your Lordship, that in any Bill which may be brought forward by Her Majesty's Government during the present session, regarding either of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge, due provision, where required, may be made therein for the free admission of any of Her Majesty's subjects, duly qualified by intellectual attainments, to matriculation and graduation at both these ancient Universities, without the imposition of any religious test.

The Memorial received Lord J. Russell's most friendly consideration, and the deputation understood that although the Cabinet could not themselves propose such a measure as that asked by the Memorialists, they would not oppose it if proposed on the part of Dissenters by independent Members of the House. It is therefore intended to move clauses in Committee; and it is confidently expected, if the friends of University education unfettered by religious tests, will exert themselves in all parts of the kingdom, by promoting petitions and putting themselves into communication with their representatives, that they can be carried. It is desirable that general petitions should be procured, to which the signatures of liberal Churchmen may be solicited; but where this cannot be effected, congregational petitions should be forwarded without delay.

We must not close these hasty remarks without an expression of our

opinion, that the friends of religious liberty are very deeply indebted to Mr. James Heywood for his zealous, long-continued and untiring exertions in the cause of University Reform. Through the press, he has been engaged for many years in diffusing valuable information on the subject; and in Parliament he elicited, by his courageous and prudent conduct in 1850, that expression of opinion which induced the Government to issue the Commissions of Inquiry into the state of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin; and latterly he has organized the movement amongst the Liberal Members for abolishing religious tests. When he began his labours, many thought he was entering on a course which, though wise and good, they feared was almost hopeless. We trust we may not be denied the pleasure hereafter of congratulating him on his complete success.

CHRISTIANITY AND SECULARISM.

The Committee of the Manchester Village Missionary Society, being of opinion that much of the unbelief which at present prevails is caused by the irrational views which are generally presented as Christianity, and thinking, too, that the Secularists have generally been opposed with a bitterness of spirit more calculated to repel them from Christianity than win them over to it, arranged for the following course of lectures, which have been delivered in the People's Institute, Heyrod Street, Manchester. The first lecture of the course was delivered on the evening of the 14th of February by the Rev. John Gordon, of Coventry. Mr. G. J. Holyoake has delivered a lecture, at different places, which he entitles, "Secularism the Positive Side of Free Inquiry." Mr. Gordon's lecture was a reply to this, and was intended to shew that "The Religious Side of Free Inquiry is as Positive as the Secular Side." As the readers of the Christian Reformer are already aware of the mode in which Mr. Gordon is accustomed to handle this argument, from the abstract of the very successful lecture which he recently delivered in Coventry, and for which he received a public expression of thanks from some of the orthodox ministers of that city, it is not necessary to give any report of his address at Manchester, which, though verbally different, was substantially the same. At

the close of the lecture some discussion took place. A person of the name of Campbell replied to Mr. Gordon, and asserted that there was no manifestation of intelligence in Nature, but what was made by man; that there was no proof of a moral order of events; and that we were the mere agents of material necessity in all the operations we undertook. He specially insisted upon the point, that the Christianity held by Mr. Gordon was not true Christianity; declaring that the real character of Christianity was to be gathered from the popular views entertained; and exhorting his hearers to take them as representative of the system, and not to admit the more reasonable conclusions which Mr. Gordon entertained.—Mr. Gordon, in his reply, very briefly touched upon the altogether unsustainable nature of the philosophy that had been propounded, and particularly exposed the unfairness of the manner in which his views of Christianity had been treated. He appealed to the Secularists whether they would have been satisfied if he had dealt, on this occasion, with Secularism as they were advised to deal with Christianity. He set forth Christianity as a matter to be judged of upon its own claims, and not by the opinions concerning it which either he or others entertained; and urged the duty of applying the free inquiry so much boasted of to the Christian as well as to the Anti-Christian side of the subject.—These remarks were listened to with the deepest attention, and the course pointed out seemed to meet with the entire sympathy of the audience.

On Sunday evening, Feb. 19th, the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., delivered a lecture on "Secularism as presented in the Bible." The object of this lecture was to shew that the Bible, if rightly interpreted, was a most valuable book, and that the Secularists make a great mistake by endeavouring to throw it aside. We regret our inability to give any detailed report respecting this lecture.

The third lecture was delivered on the evening of March 5th by the Rev. Brooke Herford, of Todmorden. The subject of this lecture was, "Immortal Life." The lecturer said his object would be to shew the true relation of the future to the present life, and that Secularism was defective as a system of life and action, because, though not denying, it ignored immortality. He should shew first what the

common idea was, and point out its errors; next, he would shew how Secularism, in its reaction against a false view, had betaken itself to no view at all; and afterwards would state what he conceived to be the true idea of a future life, and point out its practical bearing on the present. The view of the popular theology is of a future life of absolute, unchangeable, eternal happiness or torment;—salvation, escaping the torment, is to be obtained by faith, which too often is considered as mere belief, apart from practical goodness. The thought of such fearful torment, if believed, might overshadow the whole life, and raise to unnatural importance these special duties “appertaining to the future,” which thus are made to precede morality and what are called Secular duties. The practical effect of these ideas is mischievous both to life and to religion, cramping by fear all religious thought, and tending to reconcile “the Saints” to the misery and sin of a world which their view degrades.—Fortunately the world, though professing this belief, has no real faith in it,—finds this world is not so bad after all; moreover, despise it as you will, this life takes care of itself and makes its claims felt. So in the world we have faith and life at variance; men on Sundays professing to care for and live for heaven alone, but on week-days living practically for the world.—Secularism has done good in pointing out this contrariety, but has overshot the mark in its reaction. Trying the popular faith by common sense and the facts of life, it finds that this idea of eternal hell is immoral, the motives derived from it being only an extended selfishness; that it degrades earth and life to a degree felt by all to be false; while the prominence which it gives to the duties which are said to gain heaven, causes men to think worse of heresy than of sin. Now the same common sense which teaches Secularism the falsity of these views, should teach it better ones; but so used have they been to these false views, and to regard (while they were “orthodox”) utter non-belief as the only alternative, that, rejecting the false view, they reject all faith in a future life, and, thus raising a system of life which ignores the future, they are as one-sided and defective as the orthodox who degrade the present.—The lecturer held, then, that the right way is to find out a view of the future world which did not clash with common sense or common mora-

lity. But, says Secularism, “You cannot prove there is any future life.” Perhaps not; but it may be shewn that Nature corroborates the idea; and if it then be answered, Yes, but that’s only corroboration—Nature can’t *give* the idea,—he would answer, We don’t want Nature to *give* it; we have it; it is an element in human nature, and whether put there by God’s providence or Nature’s law, as Secularists would have it, it must be true. Shewing how nature did corroborate the idea, he passed on to man’s own deeper feelings and wants,—his consciousness of an approachable limit to physical growth, with the contrary consciousness of boundless possible expansion for the spiritual part. To satisfy the idea of justice, too, a future life was needed. Justice is not done here altogether; sin succeeds if this world be all; yet for wrong to be really successful, is impossible, according to the idea either of God’s providence or Nature’s law; and therefore a future life is needed by man’s moral sense—not for compensation, but for moral completeness. These are corroborations of the universal belief, which is correspondent to the universal desire for a future life. Nor can it be fairly urged that this universal desire is the mere animal love of life, worked by cunning priestcraft in superstitious faith. “Man might desire to fly,” Mr. Holyoake says; “but that is no proof that he is made to fly.” Very good; but then man *does not* desire to fly, or it is felt by all to be a mere whim; while we do desire a future life, not as a whim, but in our moments of highest and purest life. As well might it be said that man has no sense of justice, because that sense has been used by those who have embodied that sense into laws for selfish purposes, as to urge that, because man’s religious nature has been used for bad ends, therefore it does not exist. Rather did he draw the inference how deeply rooted it is, this belief in immortality, that, while it could never be *proved*, it has still held its sway; and that, though priestcraft has made the thought of it a misery, they have never uprooted it yet. But it is said Secularism does not prevent your believing this. No; but Secularism builds up a theory of life which ignores it, while it may not be ignored without injury to man. It is needed in the hard struggle of life, in which it would give man strength in doing right, permanence of effort and purpose, comfort in sorrow, and hope

in the dark hours of death. Cast away, if you will, the falsities of orthodoxy, but do not stray into the even worse error of believing nothing. Better the coarsest idea of immortality, than the downward look which sees nothing but this earth and this life.

The last lecture of the course was delivered on the evening of March 12th by the Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., on the subject entitled, "Some Advantages which the Christian has over the Secularist." Mr. Gaskell began by endeavouring to shew (in reply to an objection taken by one of the Secularist leaders at the close of Mr. Gordon's lecture) that "Revelation was *not* of necessity exclusive and condemnatory, *because made to a few*;" that with equal reason the charge might be advanced against Science; that it applied only to the theory of Orthodoxy—a theory which he proved was not in any way bound up with Christianity; and that, as a believer in revelation, he felt no call upon him to speak in a harsh and condemnatory manner of the honest expression of carefully formed, duly considered, conscientious opinion. As far as the object of the Secularists was to bring man to work in harmony with the laws of Nature, he had full sympathy with them; that, believing those laws to be established by Infinite Wisdom and Goodness, he was firmly persuaded that he who laboured faithfully to bring his being into agreement with them, would be a nobler and better man than one who, with the name of God on his lips, lived in direct antagonism to these indications of his will; and that, as all the experience of the past shewed, if humanity was fairly cultivated, the religious element would eventually be developed. The lecturer then touched on the misrepresentations which had been given of Christianity, the strange doctrines and strange practices with which it had been identified, and admitted that these were sufficient to excite prejudices against it. That it should have been able to bear up under the weight of these, proved to him how great its innate power and vitality must be,—its complete adaptation to the deepest wants of our nature. And in spite of these corruptions, how much it had done for the world, in contracting the dominion of slavery, in elevating the condition of woman, in establishing the principle of human brotherhood, in the formation of the Third Estate, &c., and especially how much the poor were indebted to it—that so

long as they had the gospel to appeal to, they could never be down-trodden and tyrannized over as they had once been.—Coming, then, to the subject of the lecture, Mr. Gaskell said he conceived that if they could discover the great principles which actuated Christ, they would be the religion of Christ; and that the religion of Christ would be Christianity. He made out those principles to be, faith in God as a Father, ever present, ever working, ever ready to help, &c.; faith in man as the child of God, leading to love of him, labour and self-sacrifice for him; and faith in an immortal life, where God would shew himself yet more a Father. After tracing the strength, for action and endurance, of Christ to such faith, he endeavoured to make it felt that to one who really cherishes it, the world must be a scene of far deeper interest than to him who recognizes in it only a collection of blind forces, with which he can have no sympathy. Next, that there are various conditions of life in which the former has an advantage. He displayed, in that of poverty, how much he gains for self-respect, and hope, and true nobleness; and so amidst the uncertainties of earth, how secure he feels while his Father is with him and heaven before him. Then considering what man is in himself, the lecturer proved how much stronger motives he has for the right cultivation of his intellect, his affections and his moral nature, in such a faith, than one can possibly have who is destitute of it. After dwelling on these points in some detail, he went on to shew that in every age men of all classes of mind, the noblest philosophers as well as the noblest poets, had made manifest that they had great spiritual wants; and that this part of our nature called for attention just as much as the moral part, and was most intimately connected with it. He then shewed how Christian faith harmonizes the outward and the inward, and clears up many of the great mysteries of our being, and gives to it an unspeakable grandeur and importance. The lecturer concluded a very eloquent discourse by beseeching his hearers to let their minds have fair play, and to do justice to Christianity by taking their views of it, not from the representations of men, but from "the Master" himself.

The whole of the lectures have been numerously attended and attentively listened to. On each occasion a member of the Secular society presided, and

at the close of each lecture a brief but very friendly discussion took place. We have every reason to believe that these lectures have done good. Mr. Hertel, one of the principal members of the Secular society, proposed that a vote of thanks be given to the lecturers for the kind and conciliating spirit which they had manifested, and in the course of his remarks said he was sure that the lectures would do much good, both to Secularists and Christians; for they had presented to the Secularists much more rational views of Christianity, and they would shew the orthodox Christians that the only way of doing good to the Secularists was to meet them in a friendly spirit, and treat them as men who were sincere in their doubts, and who were earnestly and anxiously searching for the truth.

Earnest Unitarians frequently ask the question, By what means can a knowledge of our views of Christianity be more generally diffused among the working classes? The progress of Secularism opens to us an important field of labour. There can be no doubt that much of the prevailing scepticism is a reaction from orthodoxy, and it is peculiarly the duty of Unitarians to go amongst the Secularists and endeavour to shew them that many of the doctrines they oppose are not the doctrines of Christianity, but only corruptions and false interpretations, which have gradually come to be regarded as Christianity itself. As Dr. Priestley did much for the philosophical unbelievers of his time, so may the Unitarians of the present day do much to prevent working men from rejecting that reli-

gion which is above all things calculated to bless them.

NEW RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION IN PARIS.

We have received some very interesting papers, informing us of the establishment of a new Society in Paris, called the "Universal Christian Alliance." It is founded under the auspices of M. Martin Paschoud, one of the eminent and amiable Protestant pastors of that capital, and is supported by Messrs. Odier, Artaud, A. Coquerel, and many others. It takes for its elements of union three great principles—the love of God, the Creator and Father of all men; the love of men, as the children and subjects of God; the love of Jesus Christ, as the Son of God and the Saviour of men. Under the influence of these three principles, it is to engage in various benevolent social labours, supposing that the attention of Christians has been hitherto too exclusively devoted to worship, to dogma, to ecclesiastical order. It is evidently designed as a counterpoise to the proceedings of the "Société Evangelique," and justly assumes that men are not to be dragged back into the darkness of a past age by the revival of exclusive pretensions and a persecuting spirit, but that the time has come for the union of the religious on a broader basis, and the manifestation of a "faith that worketh by love."

Hereafter we may give from the papers issued by this Society some extracts which our pre-occupied space necessarily exclude from the present No.

OBITUARY.

1854. Jan. 19, at Summit Place, Upper Clapton, DAVID GIBBS, Esq., in the 80th year of his age.

In recording the death of Mr. Gibbs, we have to lament the departure of one of those stanch and venerable supporters of Nonconformity who form the link of connection between Unitarians of the present day and their Presbyterian forefathers of the last century. There was something peculiarly dignified and excellent in the character of this class of men, and as one by one they drop the burden of mortal flesh, they leave behind them a precious influence and an honourable name, which cannot fail to "keep their memory

green" in the hearts of their friends and fellow-worshippers.

The subject of our present notice was born of Scotch parentage in London on the 7th of July, 1774. His father was wounded at Perth in the rebellion of 1745, fighting, as we may presume from the known Calvinistic character of his creed, on the side of the Hanoverian succession. His son was brought up in the gloomy faith of the Westminster Confession; but possessing from very early life a disposition of free, independent inquiry, a change in his opinions soon took place, which may be attributed, in great measure, to the eloquent preaching of Mr. Worth-

ington, of Salters' Hall, whose pulpit services there, as is well known, produced a strong impression on the more liberal portion of Dissenters, and especially on the minds of the inquiring youth of the metropolis. Mr. Gibbs afterwards enjoyed the rich privilege of attending the ministry of Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, and was an active member of the Gravel-Pit chapel through the whole of the subsequent ministry of Mr. Belsham and Mr. Aspland.

In his early life he formed one of the class of young men who benefited from the valuable lectures on Philosophy and Theology given by Mr. Belsham in the vestry of the Old Gravel-Pit, and often expressed to his later friends the large debt of gratitude he owed to that venerable divine, and the excellent influence of his lectures and classes in forming the character and strengthening the religious principles. Widely as some amongst us may differ from many of the speculative opinions entertained by Mr. Belsham, few can deny that there must have been much that was great and good in the religious system that could have produced such a type of the Christian character as that formed under its influence.

Mr. Gibbs lived afterwards for many years on the most intimate terms with the late Mr. Aspland, whose public character and services commanded his highest respect, and whose private friendship he valued as one of the chief privileges of life. Up to the time of his death he remained a constant friend and valued supporter of the younger ministers who occupied the position which had been dignified and adorned by those great and eminent men whose names have reflected lasting honour upon the old Unitarian congregation at Hackney.

Though not taking a very prominent part in the many important political and theological movements of his time, Mr. Gibbs was always in his own sphere a firm advocate and an enlightened supporter of the cause of Civil and Religious Liberty. He gained the respect of those who most widely differed from him, by his well-known fidelity to his principles, and the honest, manly independence of his character; and furnishes another testimony to the truth, that the open and consistent profession of even an unpopular faith, will gradually bring the world to approve our purposes and admire our mental honesty, if not to adopt our specific opinions.

Our departed friend served for many years as a member of the Corporation of London, and held an office of trust under it to the day of his decease. The respect he enjoyed among his fellow-citizens was evinced by his election to the office of Churchwarden of the ancient parish of Cripplegate, and to other important trusts, involving great responsibilities, which he filled with singular credit and usefulness.

During a long life, he had been variously tried by fortune. In prosperity, he never forgot the uncertainty of earthly possessions; and in adversity, he struggled manfully and successfully to overcome the difficulties by which he was surrounded. If one who only enjoyed the privilege of his friendship in his last years, may venture to describe his character, he would say that it was marked by great conscientiousness of purpose, manly good sense, and sincere, unaffected piety. Amid the increasing infirmities of age, he maintained, that greatest ornament of the old, a young and cheerful heart, delighted much in the society of children, and surprised all his friends by the active interest he shewed in the passing events of the day, especially in those political and religious events which, in his view, gave evidence of true social reform and theological progress.

To the last he expressed his heartfelt wishes for the prosperity of the congregation of which he was almost the oldest member, and watched with great interest the various efforts that have recently been made in the metropolis to encourage free thought and diffuse the principles of Unitarian Christianity.

Of him it may be said, in the language, not of empty eulogy, but of simple truth, that he fulfilled all relations of life wisely and faithfully, and has left a blank which cannot easily be filled up. May his numerous descendants ever preserve, as their most precious inheritance, the good name which he has left behind him, and lay up among the choicest treasures of their hearts the memory of that upright and honourable life!

T. L. M.

Feb. 24, at Woodbridge, Suffolk, in her 67th year, MARY, the beloved wife of Thomas T. SILVER, Esq. She was born Nov. 8th, 1787, and was the daughter of Mr. Richard Watson, of Kidderminster, a gentleman remarkable

for his conversational powers, and highly esteemed for his firm and consistent attachment to the cause of Non-conformity, a principle which he appears to have inherited from his noble-minded father, who, although a strict Calvinist in his religious faith, not only received the amiable and learned Priestley into his house, when that gentleman fled to Kidderminster from the Birmingham riots, but finding that the enraged mob were still in pursuit of their victim, and fearing that his place of retreat might be discovered, secretly conducted him to an adjoining wood, where they remained the whole night in safety. Our esteemed friend was married Sept. 27th, 1808, and while she enjoyed a larger share of conjugal happiness than falls to the lot of many, yet it pleased her Heavenly Father to visit her with much suffering and weakness during the remaining eighteen years of her life, which she bore with astonishing patience and resignation. Like her maternal relative, she was mild and affectionate in her disposition, gentle in manners, and ever attentive to the comfort and happiness of all around her. Possessing a sympathizing heart, she took great interest in relieving the poor and distressed; while her charities were always judiciously bestowed, and accompanied with this sound advice, "Do not lose your self-respect by accepting charity, but exert yourselves that you may do without it." She never relaxed in attention to cases of prolonged suffering, and the writer of this memorial, who enjoyed her friendship and society for many years, has often heard her make this remark, "that the longer the poor suffered, the more they needed assistance." But it was in the exercise of the domestic virtues where her amiable character unfolded itself. In a position to command social pleasures, yet she found her chief enjoyments in her own family circle, which she enlivened by her cheerfulness and instructed by her example. Early trained in religion and in the scriptural and soul-elevating views of Unitarian Christianity, and enjoying for forty-five years the companionship of one who during his youth was a hearer and admirer of the great Priestley, it is no wonder that her religious faith was deep and strong. It was delightful and instructive to observe its power to sustain her soul under the consciousness of approaching dissolution, and its tranquillizing influence in her peaceful death.

Without presuming to eulogize the departed, we venture to think that few spirits have left this world better prepared to enter into the presence of the "Father of spirits." Farewell, dear friend, but not for ever,—

"Thou art gone to the grave, but we will not deplore thee,
Though sorrows and darkness encompass the tomb;
The Saviour has pass'd through its portals before thee,
And the lamp of his love is thy guide through the gloom."

T. F. T.

March 2, at Wareham, Dorsetshire, DENNIS BROWN, Esq., aged 77. A protracted and distressing illness cast a shadow over his later years, and rendered his removal to a better land a source of consolation rather than affliction to those even who best loved him, but his memory will long be dearly cherished by a large circle of relatives and friends. He sustained every relation in life in a manner becoming a professor of liberal and enlightened views both in religion and politics, and manifested in the sphere in which he moved for more than threescore years and ten, an uncompromising love of truth and uprightness, invariable kindness and forbearance to his equals, and rare affability and liberality of spirit towards his dependants. May those who come after him tread in his steps!

March 11, at Stafford, aged 58, Sir THOMAS NOON TALFOURD, one of the Justices of the Court of Common Pleas. He was born at Reading in 1795, his father, Mr. Edward Talfourd, being a brewer; his mother was the daughter of Rev. Thomas Noon, an Independent minister of Reading. He was educated partly at the Dissenters' grammar-school at Mill Hill, and partly at the grammar-school of his native town, over which Dr. Valpy presided so many years. During his school days, he was noticed with attention and kindness by Joseph Fox, the benevolent promoter of the British system of education. This good man doubtless saw in the schoolboy tokens of that benevolence which was the predominating feature of his own mind. On the death of Joseph Fox in 1816, his virtues were celebrated by the muse of young Talfourd in some very beautiful lines, originally printed (as well as an obituary character) in the *Monthly Repository*.

There was doubtless something of an autobiographical character in these lines of the "Tribute:"

"Methinks in some sweet ev'ning's
holiest calm,
When every sinking breeze is charg'd
with balm,
*Some youth with genius dawning o'er
his cheek,*
To think of thee his best lov'd path
shall seek,
And 'neath some jagged oak's eternal
shade,
In holy dream of things unearthly
laid,
Hear angel voices whispering from
on high,
And trace bright visions in the West-
ern sky."

In 1813, Mr. Talfourd was entered as a student of the Middle Temple, and became a pupil in the chambers of Mr. Chitty. It is believed that before quitting Reading, a change had taken place in the religious opinions in which Mr. Talfourd was educated. About two years previously, by means of the Unitarian Fund, Unitarianism had been preached, and a small Unitarian congregation formed, in his native town. The preaching of Mr. Richard Wright, but more especially of Mr. Vidler, made a deep impression on the mind of Mr. Talfourd. It would have been impossible, under any circumstances, for the stern and gloomy Calvinism in which he had been brought up, to have long retained its hold over a genial and benevolent spirit like his. He found in Unitarianism, as preached by Mr. Vidler, a system as satisfactory to his intellect as cheering to his heart. Writing a few years afterwards on this subject, in the name of the Unitarians of Reading, respecting the reverence felt towards the memory of their early teacher, he said, "From his conversation they not only derived the highest intellectual gratification, *but have to date the best and holiest feelings which Christian truth is calculated to inspire.* They remember him with an enthusiasm of reverence." In verse as well as prose did he celebrate Mr. Vidler's worth:

"Methinks I see, by hope's great theme
inspir'd,
That form rever'd in sudden light
attir'd,
Pursue the path immortal prophets
trod,
To trace the deepest charities of God;
Then, as delight his raptur'd eye be-
dew'd,

Each mind amaz'd the glorious pros-
pect view'd;
Death's icy fetters seem'd by mercy
broke,
And sorrow dropt her sceptre as he
spoke.
Deep 'mid the fading gloom as man
could trace,
Shone vistas fair of universal grace;
Heav'n seem'd all op'ning to the ra-
vish'd sight,
With fanes half viewless from exces-
sive light;
Hell sunk a trembling spectre 'mid
the blaze,
And earth bloom'd ever young 'mid
joy and praise."

On coming to London, Mr. Talfourd soon found congenial Unitarian associates. At the house of Mr. John Towill Rutt, the editor of Dr. Priestley's works, he was a frequent visitor; and there he found, in Mr. Rutt's eldest daughter, Rachel, the companion and partner of his life. The *Times* states very truly, that "Talfourd was thrown early upon his own resources, and manfully prepared himself for the struggle of life;" but we question the strict accuracy of the writer when he proceeds to assign this circumstance to the fact of "family reverses." If we may trust our own recollections, the cause was alienation and dissatisfaction growing out of the new theological opinions which he had adopted. To this there is a touching allusion in some lines, now before us in his own remarkable MS., written April 12, 1824. They have never before been published. They were addressed to one who was by hereditary descent, as well as personal conviction, an Unitarian.

"There are whose souls have struggled
to be free
From magic bonds by superstition
spun
About submissive childhood; *who
have won*
At a great price their priceless Liberty;
But thou wast born a freeman—hast
not wrought
The glorious privilege of fearless
thought
From friendships crushed or inward
agony.
A blessed lot! Let those who long
have striven
For truth in bloody wrestle be for-
given
If they too proudly smile on men
that err;

But thou, too gentle and too wise for
scorn,
Must prove thee to thy high possessions
born,
Free Intellect's unruffled heritor."

During his studies in the Temple, he mainly supported himself by his pen and by the labours of a law reporter. He was a frequent writer for the *Champion* newspaper, and for the *London Magazine* during the editorship of Mr. John Scott. In 1817, he commenced practice as a special pleader. In that year he united with Mr. Aspland (at a meeting at Mr. A.'s house), Mr. W. J. Fox, Mr. Edgar Taylor and Mr. C. Richmond, in establishing the *Noncon Club*. He continued a member of this social club for upwards of seven years, and read, as his contribution to the literary portion of the feast, three essays—1808, Oct. 12, On the Intolerance of Protestant Dissenters as compared with that of Established Churches; 1820, Jan. 3, Essay on the supposed Connection of Poetry with Superstition and Arbitrary Power; and 1822, Dec. 2, On Atheism. The second of these essays was printed in the *Monthly Repository*, XV. 95. It will be read with interest even by those who will least approve the somewhat tumid and stilted style in which it is clothed, as containing very distinctly the germs of the ideas, equally poetical and benignant, which the author wrought out with such beauty and force in his classic drama of *Ion*. In 1821, he was called to the bar, and joined the Oxford circuit. "His practice," says the writer in the *Times*, "was moderate at first, but certain. Talfourd never faltered in the career which he had commenced with a determination to succeed, and so year followed year, and time brought with it honour, experience and gain." As a public speaker, Mr. Talfourd had at this time many drawbacks. His features had nothing of classical dignity, but were redeemed by a singularly expressive eye. His figure and carriage were not graceful; his elocution had some great defects, but was energetic and fervid. It may surprise some to learn that at one period of his life Talfourd took great interest in private theatricals, and, by the profound force of sympathy with his character, conquered all his physical disadvantages, and made a very effective representation of Addison's Cato. In a prologue prepared by him on this occasion, occur these lines, of which the justice of the

sentiment equals, if it do not surpass, the vigour of the expression :

"And breathes there one, who, cas'd
in pride austere,
Refuses to his last *mistake* a tear?
Who Pagan greatness as a crime deplores,
And owns no greatness save on Christian shores—
One who could see with scorn a Cato bleed,
And boast a soundness, not of *heart*,
but *creed*?
Forbid it, Mercy; teach him by thy nod,
To libel man is to dishonour God."

Mr. Talfourd's style was encumbered by both redundancy of words and by their poetic character. They were too seldom drawn from the "pure well of English undefiled." By his strong sympathy with whatever deserved it, his manifest kindliness and purity of feeling, he soon created in those who listened to him a feeling of interest and regard, which was eminently serviceable to him as an advocate. In cases that admitted and called for high flights of fancy and oratory, he manifested a strength of intellectual pinion rarely equalled in our courts of law. It is said that his first great cause, that which secured him his position on circuit, was at the Stafford assizes. In 1833, having previously without success applied for a silk gown, he took the Sergeant's coif. From about this period he ceased to be connected with any Unitarian or Nonconformist religious societies. We do not suppose there was any decided change of religious opinion. In his great work, *Ion*, published subsequently to the change of his habits as a religious worshiper, there breathes the spirit of pure Christianity which he had learnt from his Unitarian teachers and associates. However they might regret the discontinuance of personal sympathies, and his want of resolution to face the world with an unflinching Nonconformity when he began to ascend to the higher honours of his profession, they never feared from his kind and gentle nature any of the harshness which men of a different mould, like Southey and Coleridge, exhibited under a not dissimilar change. In 1835, his fellow-townsmen elected him one of their representatives in Parliament. He was re-elected in the Parliament chosen in 1847. In 1849, he received, while at the Stafford assizes, his appointment as Judge.

His death was fearfully sudden, and, occurring as it did when he was seated on the Bench and giving the charge to the grand jury of the county of Stafford, has made a profoundly deep impression on the public mind of England. Most of our readers will have seen his last words, on which we quote the commentary of the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*:

"When Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd fell back upon his chair and expired at Stafford, he was uttering sentiments to the grand jury which make his death dramatic as well as melancholy. The age has gone by for such scenes to be regarded as a divine interference with the inflexible course of nature; but when one of the Judges of the land expires of apoplexy, without a minute's warning, and while in the very act of commenting upon the crimes of his country, the words which he utters on the threshold of death must have a painful, if not a prophetic, interest to the whole nation. Death always gives emphasis to human language; and the curious have entered upon dissertations to shew that the last words of great men have betrayed the ruling passion of their lives. The great mathematician cries out that the square of twelve is 144, and expires; and the great hero of war cannot die until he has told his comrades that their country expects every man to do his duty. Equally appropriate and remarkable were the last words of the departed Judge, whose life and writings are distinguished for the most generous sympathy. 'In one word,' said he, 'the want of English society is sympathy;' and, having said so, his head fell, his pulse ceased to beat, and the noble man was no more! It calls to our recollection the tragic death of his own fine hero, the Ion who rises from obscurity to fame, but dies at the altar out of regard to his country. It can only be fair to the memory of one whose death all the nation laments, to enforce the sentiment which runs through his speech. Mr. Justice Coleridge has told the grand jury at Derby, that his lamented brother 'had one ruling purpose of his life, the doing

good to his fellow-creatures in his generation;' and his Lordship was 'quite sure he has left a void that cannot easily be filled up;' but we are left in possession of the views which the deceased Judge entertained about the way to suppress or to mitigate crime, delivered in his last moments, enforced by his whole life, and rendered impressive by the shadow of the tomb."

To the list of Sir T. N. Talfourd's works may, we believe, be added the pleasing Memoir (printed, but not published, in 1845) of his venerable father-in-law, John Towill Rutt, prefixed to a collection of his verses. Those who possess the Monthly Repository will find, by the aid of the initials T. N. T., many of Mr. Talfourd's contributions, especially in volumes XI., XII. and XIII. The last-named volume contains a very noble prose tribute to the character of Sir Samuel Romilly.

March 11, at Maidstone, Mr. JOHN GREEN, late of Hayle Mill, in the 83rd year of his age.

A long and active life, though accompanied by severe vicissitudes, left his mind clear, calm and peaceful to the last. Few men possessed more kindness of disposition, or manifested more true sympathy for others, and few were more impressed with a sense of the Divine goodness even under the trials of life. His old age was marked by the readiest interest in the pursuits and amusements of the young, and they in their turn felt that his presence was never a check on their joyous and eager spirit.

To shew of what nature were his religious sentiments, it may be recorded that he dwelt with much satisfaction on the words of Christ, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." These words he chose for his son's first sermon, and they retained their interest in his mind till nearly the final hour. May our latter end be like his!